NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

CIS
Congressional Information Service
Washington, D.C.

Calendar No. 701

101st Congress *2d Session*	SENATE	Report 101-378

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1991

July 19 (legislative day July 10), 1990.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. Johnston, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 5019]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 5019) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

AMOUNT IN NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1991

Amount of bill as passed by the House	$20,775,518,000
Budget estimates considered by House	20,200,277,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate	20,202,225,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	20,782,405,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Over the budget estimate, 1991	+580,180,000
Over the House-passed bill	+6,887,000

CONTENTS

TITLE I

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:

Corps of Engineers—Civil:

Page

Construction, general 23
Flood control and coastal emergencies 36
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries 36
General expenses 61
General investigations 8
General regulatory functions 60
Operation and maintenance, general 42

TITLE II

Department of the Interior:

Bureau of Reclamation:

Construction Program 66
Emergency fund 74
General administrative expenses 74
General investigations 62
Loan Program 73
Operation and maintenance 73
Working Capital Fund 75

TITLE III

Department of Energy:

Atomic energy defense activities 143
Departmental administration 182
Energy supply, research and development activities 77
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 195
General science and research activities 135
Geothermal Resources Development Fund 195
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund 141
Office of Inspector General 186

Power marketing administrations:

Alaska Power Administration 189
Bonneville Power Administration 189
Southeastern Power Administration 193
Southwestern Power Administration 194
Western Area Power Administration 194
Uranium supply and enrichment activities 129

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:

Appalachian Regional Commission 197
Defense Nuclear Safety Board 197
Delaware River Basin Commission 198
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin 198
Nuclear Regulatory Commission 199
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board 202
Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator 202
Susquehanna River Basin Commission 200
Tennessee Valley Authority 201

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1991 beginning October 1, 1990, and ending September 30, 1991, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities (except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions), including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian regional development programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 1991 budget estimates for the bill total $20,202,225,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $20,782,405,000. This is $580,180,000 over the budget estimates and $6,887,000 over the House bill.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $10,980,258,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Testing	$487,160,000
Research and development	1,206,661,000
Production and surveillance	2,588,054,000
Nuclear materials production	2,341,900,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration	2,680,616,000
Nuclear directed energy weapons SDI	106,904,000
New production reactor	375,000,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $2,745,615,000 for energy supply, research, development and demonstration programs including:

Solar energy	$129,673,000
Environmental restoration and waste management (nondefense)	513,685,000
Nuclear fission R&D	330,490,000
Magnetic fusion	325,300,000
Basic energy sciences	721,275,000
Biological and environmental health	396,394,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $1,273,732,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$621,187,000
Nuclear physics	330,729,000
Superconducting super collider	317,866,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $912,291,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission	$180,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	122,750,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	471,320,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	125,000,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $4,393,896,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Federal Water Resource Development Program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the area of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Water is our Nation's most precious and valuable resource. It is evident that water supply in the near future will be as important, if not more so, than energy. There is only so much water available. Water cannot be manufactured. Our Nation cannot survive without water, and economic prosperity cannot occur without a plentiful supply.

While many areas of the country suffer from severe shortages of water, others suffer from the other extreme—an excess of water which threatens both rural and urban areas with floods. Because water is a national asset, and because the availability and control of water affect and benefit all States and jurisdictions, the Federal Government has historically assumed much of the responsibility for financing of water resource development.

The existing national water resource infrastructure in America is an impressive system of dams, locks, harbors, canals, irrigation systems, reservoirs, and recreation sites with a central purpose—to serve the public's needs.

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system—providing clean, efficient, and economical transportation of fuels for energy generation and agricultural production, and making possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

Reservoir projects provide hydroelectric power production and downstream flood protection, make available recreational opportunities for thousands of urban residents, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, and provide our communities and industries with abundant and clean water supplies which are essential not only to life itself, but also to help maintain a high standard of living for the American people.

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development.

NEED FOR WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AUTHORIZATION BILL

The Committee wishes to state its strong support for the continuation of biennial enactment of authorizing legislation for the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers. Many that are involved today were not in place during the difficult period preceding passage of the landmark Water Resources Development Act of 1986. The acrimony which existed between the Congress and the executive branch at that time must not recur. While a good working relationship was established with the previous administration during the development of the 1986 act, and continued during negotiations on the Water Resources Development Act of 1988, there are now indications that cooperative atmosphere with the Congress on water resources matters may be on the decline.

The task of the Committee on Appropriations in the development of the Corps of Engineers budget has been greatly facilitated by the reinstatement of a regular authorization process. In May of this year, the Committee on Environment and Public Works ordered reported responsible legislation which is fully in keeping with the cost sharing and user fee policies of the 1986 and 1988 Water Resources Development Acts.

Unfortunately, Senate consideration of this bill has been delayed because the executive branch has insisted that its written views on the bill be taken into account. The bill was ordered reported on May 22, 1990, providing ample time for administration review. It was hoped it would be passed prior to action on this appropriations bill, thus providing this Committee some guidelines. Again, these actions would seem to indicate that the previous climate of cooperation may no longer exist and that there may be no water resources development bill acceptable.

The Committee on Appropriations supports the efforts of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee to enact a 1990 Water Resources Development Act. This Committee urges the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, OMB, and all interested parties to do the same, rather than contribute to a return to the bitter pre-1986 environment.

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT PETITIONS

Columbia and Snake River salmon petition.— This spring, petitions were filed with the National Marine Fisheries Service of the Department of Commerce to declare five species of Columbia and Snake River salmon as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. Those include the Snake River sockeye, the lower Columbia River coho, and the spring, summer, and fall Chinook Snake River runs. These actions triggered the beginning of a 2-year scientific and administrative review process which, upon completion in the spring of 1992, may result in a determination that a listing is not warranted. If the listing of even just one of the salmon runs is deemed to be warranted, the result could be devastating, not just to the Pacific Northwest, but the Federal Government, as well.

For the Pacific Northwest the worst-case scenario of a salmon listing could implicate nearly 6,000 megawatts of hydro electricpower, a great deal of which is sold to California over the Pacific intertie. It could affect some or all of the nearly $6,000,000,000 of commerce and trade which is transported on the Columbia and Snake River system annually. As well, a listing would impact nearly $1,500,000,000 in agricultural crops grown on nearly 52,000 farming units within Federal reclamation projects in the region.

While the regional economic impacts could be severe, the impacts on the Federal Government would be no less onerous. The Federal Government owns and operates 30 flood control, irrigation, and multipurpose water projects on the Columbia and Snake River system. It goes without saying that if a listing were to occur, construction of new projects in the basin would be curtailed. More importantly, under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, Federal agencies operating existing facilities may be forced to seek a no jeopardy determination from the National Marine Fisheries Service prior to undertaking any of the routine operating activities of those projects, if a listing were to occur.

Of equal consideration for the Federal Government is that initial construction costs and upgrades for these facilities are being repaid to the U.S. Treasury, with interest, on an annual basis. In 1989 alone, the Bonneville Power Administration repaid the Treasury $606,400,000 in principle and interest toward the costs allocated to electric generation at these projects. If operations of the Federal facilities were limited or curtailed due to an endangered salmon listing, there is little question that increased expenditures for fisheries enhancement would be accompanied by a curtailment of the financial revenues that are now derived from those facilities.

Finally, because the species for which these petitions have been filed are anadromous salmon runs whose range include international waters, the Federal Government might be faced with the awkward task of having to renegotiate several international fishing treaties with Canada and native American tribal interests who have been apportioned salmon harvest allocations. The U.S. attorney's office already is negotiating on Indian harvest levels under the *United States* v. *Oregon* case, and the Commerce Department, Interior Department, and State Department all are comanaging implementation of the United States-Canada Salmon Treaty which was ratified by Congress in 1985.

It is not the intent of the Committee to prejudge the outcome of the scientific review process which, admittedly, will attempt to answer questions never before raised in the public policy arena. Nevertheless, if a listing decision is warranted by the scientific findings the implications could be severe for both regional and national interests.

Therefore, the Committee strongly recommends that the Secretary of the Army on behalf of the Corps of Engineers, the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Secretary of Energy on behalf of the Bonneville Power Administration, cooperate with their regional offices in providing any additional staff or budgetary resources, or in making minor changes in operating procedures, in order to deal with this matter. Given our experience thus far with other endangered species petitions in the Pacific Northwest, this early involvement at the headquarters level will help assure that all the available options have been fully explored at the regional level prior to making its way to Washington, DC.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held 10 sessions in connection with the fiscal year 1991 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies, numerous Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local officials and representatives, and hundreds of private citizens of all walks of life from throughout the United States. Testimony, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal year 1991, therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on July 18, 1990, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on July 19, 1990, recommended that the bill, as amended be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1990	$129,251,000
Budget estimate, 1991	135,400,000
House allowance	167,847,000
Committee recommendation	153,335,000

An appropriation of $153,335,000 is recommended by the Committee.

The recommended amounts provided under this account for surveys and planning activities are shown in the following table, with Committee comments following immediately after the tabulation.

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	ALABAMA								
[N]	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	4,828,000	333,000	---	347,000	---	347,000	---	347,000
[N]	CHICKASAW CREEK, AL	325,000	45,000	30,000	---	30,000	---	30,000	---
	CHOCTAWHATCHEE & PEA RIVER BASIN, AL & FL	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
[FDP]	VALLEY CREEK, WARRIOR RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AL	721,000	657,000	64,000	---	64,000	---	64,000	---
	ALASKA								
[SP]	BETHEL, AK	13,900,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	270,000
[N]	KODIAK HARBOR, AK	16,830,000	1,054,000	---	233,000	---	233,000	---	233,000
[FDP]	RIVERS AND HARBORS, AK	9,832,000	9,415,000	396,000	---	396,000	---	396,000	---
[FDP]	SEWARD, AK	698,000	200,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
[FDP]	UNALASKA, AK	513,000	377,000	136,000	---	136,000	---	136,000	---
	ARIZONA								
[FDP]	CENTRAL MARICOPA COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	1,250,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	300,000	---
[FDP]	GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY, AZ	500,000	145,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
[FDP]	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ	1,254,000	981,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
[FDP]	HASSAYAMPA RIVER NEAR WICKENBURG, AZ	750,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
	HOLBROOK, AZ	---	---	---	---	---	900,000	---	900,000
[FC]	NOGALES WASH, AZ	5,250,000	1,100,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
	PINAL COUNTY, AZ	500,000	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---
[FC]	RILLITO, AZ	12,300,000	1,105,000	---	610,000	---	610,000	---	610,000
[FDP]	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	1,250,000	488,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	ARKANSAS								
[FDP]	CENTRAL ARKANSAS STUDY, AR	1,570,000	771,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
[FDP]	LITTLE RIVER COUNTY, ARK	200,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
[FDP]	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, HOT SPRINGS, GARLAND COUNTY, AR.	1,065,000	438,000	275,000	---	275,000	---	275,000	---
	RED RIVER WW, SHREVEPORT, LA TO VICINITY OF INDEX, AR.	---	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	50,000
	RED RIVER WW, INDEX, AR TO DENISON DAM, TX	---	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	300,000
	AMERICAN SAMOA								
[COM]	TERRITORIES DEVELOPMENT STUDY, AS	1,276,000	539,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	CALIFORNIA								
[FC]	AMERICAN AND SACRAMENTO RIVERS, CA	375,000,000	---	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
	ARROYO PASAJERO [FRESNO COUNTY], CA	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
	CACHE CREEK BASIN [LAKE COUNTY], CA	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
	CALIENTE CREEK, CA	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	CALLEGUAS CREEK, CA	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
[SPE]	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTH COAST REGION	2,000,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
[FC]	COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	43,100,000	1,576,000	---	424,000	---	424,000	---	424,000
[FC]	DRY CREEK, ROSEVILLE, CA	2,900,000	10,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
[N]	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY [DEEPENING], CA	875,000	550,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
[FC]	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	187,500,000	506,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
[N]	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	9,070,000	8,820,000	250,000	---	250,000	3,000,000	250,000	---
	LOS ANGELES RIVER WATERCOURSE IMPROVEMENT, CA	---	---	---	---	700,000	---	---	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
[FC]	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	6,140,000	262,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000
	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	---	---	---	---	380,000	---	150,000	---
[N]	MONTEREY HARBOR, CA	775,000	193,000	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
[N]	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	3,000,000	2,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---	270,000
[FC]	NAPA RIVER, CA	77,715,000	4,534,000	---	410,000	---	410,000	---	410,000
	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, AMER RVR WATERSHED, CA	---	---	---	---	275,000	---	---	---
	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO METRO AREA, CA.	---	---	---	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
[FDP]	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, YOLO BYPASS, CA	1,250,000	150,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
[FDP]	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	1,250,000	550,000	375,000	---	375,000	---	375,000	---
[N]	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	3,600,000	493,000	---	175,000	---	257,000	---	257,000
	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	300,000	---
[FDP]	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	3,665,000	3,228,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
[SP]	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, OCEAN BEACH, CA	875,000	143,000	336,000	---	336,000	---	336,000	---
[N]	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	750,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	150,000	---
[FDP]	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALAVERAS RIVER, CA	1,125,000	500,000	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---
[FDP]	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER, CA	1,125,000	1,055,000	70,000	---	70,000	---	70,000	---
[FDP]	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, MOKELUMNE RIVER & TRIBS, CA..	1,225,000	428,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
[FDP]	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SAN JOAQUIN R MAIN STEM & TRI	1,250,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	250,000	---
[FDP]	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	750,000	686,000	64,000	---	154,000	---	64,000	---
[FDP]	SAN LORENZO, CA	1,152,000	1,054,000	98,000	---	98,000	---	98,000	---
[FC]	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	3,200,000	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
[N]	SAN RAFAEL CANAL, CA	111,700,000	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
[FDP]	SANTA ANA RIVER & ORANGE CO, CA	9,560,000	9,290,000	270,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---
[SP]	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY (BEACH EROSION), CA	830,000	620,000	122,000	---	122,000	---	122,000	---
[N]	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	---	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
	SANTA BARBARA & VENTURA COUNTIES, EMERG WATER SUPPLIES,	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	SANTA CRUZ HARBOR SHOALING, CA	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	100,000	---
[N]	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA	535,000	310,000	142,000	---	142,000	---	142,000	---
[FDP]	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	1,178,000	658,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
[N]	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	5,000,000	449,000	---	210,000	---	300,000	---	210,000
[FDP]	WALNUT CREEK BASIN, CA	1,436,000	1,351,000	85,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	WHITERIVER RIVER BASIN, CA	---	---	---	---	340,000	---	---	---
	COLORADO								
[FC]	ALAMOSA, CO	5,600,000	114,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000
[FDP]	BOXELDER, SPRING, & DRY CREEKS, FT. COLLINS, CO	450,000	144,000	70,000	---	70,000	---	70,000	---
[FDP]	GOOSE CREEK, BOULDER, CO	316,000	60,000	70,000	---	70,000	---	70,000	---
[FDP]	RALSTON AND LEYDEN CREEKS, CO	362,000	215,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	CONNECTICUT								
[COM]	WEST CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING, CT	500,000	364,000	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
	DELAWARE								
[N]	C&D CANAL-BALTIMORE HARBOR CONNECTING CHNLS (DEEP.), D	2,615,000	663,000	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
[SP]	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ	450,000	95,000	355,000	---	355,000	---	355,000	---
[SP]	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	2,250,000	357,000	393,000	---	393,000	---	393,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	FLORIDA								
	BREVARD COUNTY, FL [SHORE PROTECTION]	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
[N]	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,600,000	30,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
[N]	CANAVERAL HARBOR, SAND BYPASS, FL	500,000	85,000	---	415,000	---	415,000	---	415,000
[FDP]	COAST OF FLORIDA EROSION AND STORM EFFECTS STUDY, FL	8,230,000	1,340,000	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000	---
[FDP]	FROG POND, FL	625,000	77,000	98,000	---	98,000	---	98,000	---
[FDP]	HILLSBORO CANAL, FL	630,000	446,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
[FDP]	LOWER HILLSBOROUGH RIVER AND CURIOSITY CREEK, FL	550,000	160,000	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	---	---	---	---	---	350,000	---	---
[N]	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	20,200,000	1,526,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
	MIAMI RIVER SEDIMENTS, FL	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
	MONROE COUNTY BEACH EROSION, FL [SMATHERS BEACH]	---	---	---	---	---	193,000	---	---
[N]	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL	400,000	100,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
[BE]	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL	31,913,000	1,352,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000
[N]	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	6,167,000	85,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
	PERDIDO KEY BEACHES, FL	---	---	---	---	30,000	---	---	---
	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---
	SOUTH CENTRAL FLORIDA SIMULATION MODEL, FL	---	---	---	---	207,000	---	---	---
	ST. JOHNS RIVER, FL [WATER QUALITY MGMT]	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
	ST. PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	---	---	---	---	65,000	---	---	---
	TAMPA BAY [COASTAL AREAS], FL	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
[N]	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA RIVER AND BIG BEND, FL	250,000	100,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	GEORGIA								
[N]	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	7,080,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
[SP]	GLYNN COUNTY BEACHES, GA	800,000	100,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER, GA	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
[MP]	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, WILDLIFE MITIGATION, GA	25,730,000	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
[N]	SAVANNAH HARBOR COMPREHENSIVE, GA	8,940,000	129,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
[N]	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXTENSION, GA	700,000	181,000	150,000	---	---	---	150,000	---
[FDP]	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA, SC & NC	736,000	513,000	123,000	---	123,000	---	123,000	---
	SOUTH ATLANTIC CONTAINERIZED CARGO TRAFFIC STUDY, GA	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
	HAWAII								
[N]	HILO HARBOR, HI	4,020,000	64,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
[FDP]	URBAN FLOOD CONTROL - HONOLULU, HI	750,000	171,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	WAIKIKI BEACH, HI	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	IDAHO								
[FDP]	COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID, MT, OR & WA	21,423,000	21,362,000	61,000	---	61,000	---	61,000	---
[FC]	LITTLE WOOD RIVER, VICINITY OF GOODING AND SHOSHONE, I	4,050,000	200,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
[FDP]	UPPER SNAKE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID & WY	8,288,000	8,077,000	211,000	---	211,000	---	211,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	ILLINOIS								
[FDP]	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	916,000	617,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	APPLE CREEK RESERVOIR, IL	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
	CASINO BEACH, CHICAGO, IL	---	---	---	---	---	220,000	---	---
[FDP]	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	1,530,000	1,024,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
[BE]	ILLINOIS BEACH STATE PARK, IL	5,190,000	95,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
[RCP]	ILLINOIS WATERWAY NAVIGATION STUDY	10,150,000	390,000	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
[FC]	MCCOOK & THORNTON RESERVOIRS [CUP], IL	327,000,000	1,971,000	---	---	---	2,000,000	---	1,000,000
[N]	OLMSTEAD LOCKS & DAM, IL & KY	801,000,000	13,023,000	---	3,532,000	---	---	---	5,532,000
[RCP]	UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, IL, IA, MN,.	5,100,000	586,000	514,000	---	514,000	---	514,000	---
	INDIANA								
[FC]	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	12,100,000	1,315,000	---	585,000	---	585,000	---	585,000
[BE]	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	21,400,000	320,000	---	105,000	---	105,000	---	105,000
	INDIANAPOLIS, IN	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
[N]	JEFFERSONVILLE, IN	250,000	123,000	127,000	---	127,000	---	127,000	---
	LAKE GEORGE, HOBART, IN	---	---	---	---	---	125,000	---	---
	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN [CADY MARSH DITCH], IN	---	---	---	---	---	220,000	---	100,000
[FDP]	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMPRE. STUDY, IN & IL[MID WABASH R	1,090,000	490,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
[FDP]	WHITE RIVER/EAGLE CREEK, IN	500,000	---	---	---	---	---	270,000	---
	IOWA								
[FDP]	BLACK HAWK COUNTY, IA	400,000	71,000	89,000	---	89,000	---	89,000	---
[N]	MISSOURI RIVER F&WL MITIGATION, IA, NE, KS & MO	54,700,000	296,000	---	429,000	---	429,000	---	429,000
[FC]	PERRY CREEK, IA	25,400,000	1,408,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	485,000
[FDP]	THURMAN TO HAMBURG, IA	265,000	113,000	97,000	---	97,000	---	97,000	---
[FC]	WEST DES MOINES-DES MOINES, IA	13,500,000	846,000	---	354,000	---	354,000	---	354,000
	KANSAS								
[FC]	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	13,400,000	507,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
[FDP]	ARKANSAS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, GREAT BEND, KS TO TULS	4,900,000	4,318,000	582,000	---	582,000	---	582,000	---
[FDP]	CANEY RIVER, KS & OK	904,000	414,000	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
[RCP]	SOLDIER CREEK DIVERSION UNIT, TOPEKA, KS	365,000	205,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
[FDP]	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO	679,000	540,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
[FC]	UPPER LITTLE ARKANSAS RIVER WATERSHED, KS	11,100,000	1,179,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000
[FC]	WINFIELD, KS	4,100,000	171,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	KENTUCKY								
	BEAVER CREEK, FLOYD COUNTY, KY	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000
[N]	CUMBERLAND-TENNESSEE RIVERS, KY, GA, AL, MS, NC, TN &	12,665,000	8,371,000	1,008,000	---	1,008,000	---	1,008,000	---
[FDP]	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	220,000	49,000	171,000	---	171,000	---	171,000	---
[N]	GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY	2,800,000	800,000	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
[FC]	HAZARD, KY	6,880,000	93,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
[FDP]	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES [EAGLE CREEK INTERIM]	500,000	---	---	---	---	---	500,000	---
[FDP]	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, KY [JACKSON INTERIM]	1,400,000	180,000	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---
[FDP]	LICKING RIVER, KY	2,000,000	800,000	100,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
[N]	MCALPINE LOCKS AND D:M, IN & KY	125,500,000	150,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
[FDP]	METRO LOUISVILLE, KY	1,500,000	620,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
[FDP]	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	18,320,000	15,843,000	1,065,000	---	1,065,000	---	1,065,000	---
[N]	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM, KY, IL & IN [UNIONTOWN LOCKS & D	5,000,000	550,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
[FDP]	SALT RIVER BASIN, KY	975,000	150,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
[FC]	SOUTH FRANKFORT, KY	7,250,000	1,190,000	---	152,000	---	152,000	---	152,000
	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE [FLOYDS FORK, ROUTT ROAD BRIDGE], KY.	---	---	---	---	---	86,000	---	---
	LOUISIANA								
[N]	ALGIERS LOCK, LA	2,300,000	---	---	---	625,000	---	625,000	---
[FC]	ALOHA RIGOLETTE, LA	6,600,000	531,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
[FDP]	AMITE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, LA	2,966,000	2,376,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
[N]	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE - JUMP WATERWAY, LA	288,000	266,000	22,000	---	22,000	---	22,000	---
[FC]	COMITE RIVER, LA	18,000,000	50,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000
[N]	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000
[FDP]	LA COASTAL AREA, LOUISIANA COMPRE. COASTAL WETLANDS, L	1,452,000	708,000	563,000	---	563,000	---	1,030,000	---
[FDP]	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA	653,000	515,000	78,000	---	78,000	---	78,000	---
[FDP]	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LAND LOSS & MARSH CREATION, LA	1,696,000	1,363,000	171,000	---	171,000	---	171,000	---
[N]	MERMENTAU RIVER, GIWW TO THE GULF, LA	956,000	230,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
[FDP]	MERMENTAU, VERMILION AND CALCASIEU RIVERS & BAYOU TECH	5,359,000	8,522,000	460,000	---	460,000	---	660,000	---
	ORLEANS & JEFFERSON PARISHES [COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD CONTROL & WATER QUALITY], LA	---	---	---	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
[COM]	RED RIVER BASIN, AR & LA, COMPREHENSIVE STUDY	2,880,000	792,000	425,000	---	425,000	---	425,000	---
[FC]	TANGIPAHOA, TCHEFUNCTE, AND TICKFAW RIVERS, LA	2,647,000	524,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
[FC]	UPPER BAYOU TECHE, LA	---	50,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
[FC]	WEST BANK HURRICANE PROTECTION, EAST OF HARVEY CANAL	1,600,000	---	---	---	---	600,000	---	600,000
	WEST BANK HURRICANE PROTECTION, LAKE CATAOUACHE LEVEE	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	MARYLAND								
[FDP]	ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	960,000	260,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
[N]	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS	150,000	---	---	---	---	---	150,000	---
[SPEC]	CHESAPEAKE BAY TIME VARIABLE MODEL, MD, PA, VA, DC	5,825,000	1,500,000	---	---	---	---	250,000	---
[RCP]	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE REALLOCATION, MD & WV	469,000	150,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	250,000	---
[FDP]	MONONGAHELA RIVER BASIN, MD, PA & WV	1,550,000	500,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS								
[N]	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	17,955,000	10,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
	CONNECTICUT RIVER, MA	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
	HYANNIS HARBOR, MA	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
[FC]	SAUGUS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MA	57,345,000	500,000	---	2,400,000	---	2,400,000	---	2,400,000
[FDP]	SPICKET RIVER, MA & NH	635,000	285,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	MICHIGAN								
	CLINTON RIVER SPILLWAY, MI.............................	---	---	---	---	225,000	---	---	---
[FC]	ECORSE CREEK, MI......................................	4,560,000	59,000	---	205,000	---	205,000	---	205,000
[N]	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI................................	11,400,000	---	---	---	---	350,000	---	---
[N]	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHNLS & HBRS FINAL REPORT, MN,M	6,070,000	95,000	---	360,000	---	360,000	---	360,000
[RDP]	MENOMINEE RIVER, MI & WI..............................	170,000	67,000	103,000	---	103,000	---	103,000	---
[N]	MONROE HARBOR, MI.....................................	20,878,000	817,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
[N]	SAGINAW BAY AND SAGINAW RIVER, MI.....................	150,000	---	---	---	---	---	150,000	---
[N]	ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI.................................	418,000	129,000	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
	MINNESOTA								
	BUFFALO RIVER, MN......................................	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
[FDP]	CROOKSTON, MN...	905,000	334,000	290,000	---	290,000	---	290,000	---
[FC]	HOUSTON, MN...	4,560,000	926,000	---	284,000	---	284,000	---	284,000
	LITTLE FALLS, MN.......................................	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
[FDP]	RED LAKE & CLEARWATER RIVERS , MN.....................	500,000	48,000	152,000	---	152,000	---	152,000	---
	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, MN.............................	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
[FC]	ST. PAUL, MN..	7,160,000	1,303,000	---	397,000	---	397,000	---	397,000
[RDP]	WAHPETON, ND - BRECKENRIDGE, MN.......................	285,000	210,000	60,000	---	60,000	---	60,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI								
[FDP]	CANEY CREEK, JACKSON, MS..............................	410,000	160,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
[N]	ESCATAWPA RIVER, JACKSON COUNTY, MS...................	---	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
[FDP]	JACKSON METROPOLITAN AREA, MS.........................	850,000	350,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
[FDP]	PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN, MS............................	2,610,000	2,135,000	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
	MISSOURI								
[FDP]	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO.....................	568,000	505,000	63,000	---	63,000	---	63,000	---
[FC]	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO.....................	---	---	---	10,000	---	10,000	---	10,000
[FC]	COLDWATER CREEK, MO...................................	15,500,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
[FDP]	CUIVRE RIVER AREA AND VICINITY, MO....................	1,000,000	445,000	135,000	---	135,000	---	135,000	---
[FDP]	DARDENNE CREEK, MO....................................	897,000	129,000	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000	---
[RDP]	DRY FORK AND EAST FORK LAKES, FISHING RIVER, MO.......	525,000	102,000	103,000	---	103,000	---	103,000	---
	JEFFERSON COUNTY, MO...................................	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
[FDP]	PLATTIN CREEK, MO.....................................	650,000	250,000	155,000	---	155,000	---	155,000	---
[FC]	RIVER DES PERES, MO...................................	15,270,000	882,000	---	718,000	---	718,000	---	718,000
[FDP]	ST. JOSEPH, MO AND VICINITY...........................	858,000	250,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
	ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MO...................................	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
	ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL..............................	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
	STE. GENEVIEVE, MO.....................................	---	---	---	---	---	600,000	---	300,000
[FDP]	WYACONDA RIVER BASIN, MO AND IA.......................	385,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	NEBRASKA								
[FDP]	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE...........................	360,000	249,000	21,000	---	21,000	---	21,000	---
[FDP]	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE..........................	296,000	268,000	28,000	---	28,000	---	28,000	---
[FC]	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE..........................	2,931,000	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	NEVADA								
[FDP]	LAS VEGAS WASH & TRIBS [DUCK CREEK], NV................	1,000,000	386,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV........................	---	---	---	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
[FDP]	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, NV................................	300,000	43,000	257,000	---	257,000	---	500,000	---
[FC]	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV......................	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
[FC]	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV....................................	51,500,000	2,824,000	---	1,476,000	---	1,476,000	---	1,476,000
	WASHOE VALLEY, ELKO, NV................................	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
	NEW JERSEY								
[N]	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA.	7,035,000	6,648,000	290,000	---	290,000	---	290,000	---
[N]	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ PA & DE................	---	---	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
[N]	DE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ, TIOGA MARIN	1,960,000	149,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
[FC]	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NJ.................................	28,700,000	1,982,000	---	590,000	---	590,000	---	590,000
	MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ....................................	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
[FC]	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	14,500,000	572,000	---	420,000	---	420,000	---	420,000
[SP]	NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION............................	700,000	---	---	---	---	---	700,000	---
[FC]	PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM, NJ.............................	880,000,000	4,650,000	---	5,000,000	---	5,800,000	---	5,000,000
[FC]	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ............................	6,000,000	873,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
[FC]	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ.........	153,800,000	5,562,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
[N]	SALEM RIVER, NJ..	9,900,000	107,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
[SP]	TOWNSEND INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET [NJ SHORE PROT]......	3,400,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
	NEW MEXICO								
[FDP]	ALBUQUERQUE ARROYOS, NM................................	800,000	180,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
[FDP]	ESPANOLA VALLEY, NM....................................	300,000	---	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
[FDP]	LAS CRUCES, NM, EL PASO AND VICINITY...................	1,000,000	260,000	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
[FC]	ROSWELL, PECOS RIVER, NM...............................	18,900,000	---	---	460,000	---	460,000	---	460,000
[FC]	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,.	29,700,000	1,247,000	---	263,000	---	263,000	---	263,000
	NEW YORK								
[BE]	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INL TO NORTON PT., NY.	26,200,000	1,650,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
[N]	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY...............................	1,000,000	425,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
[SP]	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY..................................	1,135,000	580,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
[SPEC]	MONTANK POINT, NY......................................	500,000	---	---	---	---	---	500,000	---
[N]	OLCOTT HARBOR, NY......................................	7,740,000	1,036,000	---	364,000	---	364,000	---	364,000
	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY......................................	---	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---
[FC]	WESTCHESTER CTY STREAMS, SHELDRAKE R TOWN OF MAMARONEC	2,625,000	429,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
[N]	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY...................................	200,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA								
	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LOCKWOODS FOLLY INLET..	---	---	---	--	465,000	---	---	---
[N]	CAPE FEAR-NORTHEAST [CAPE FEAR] RIVER, NC..............	750,000	90,000	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC................................	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	125,000	---
[FDP]	EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA ABOVE CAPE LOOKOUT, NC..........	1,602,000	1,487,000	115,000	---	365,000	---	365,000	---
[N]	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC...............................	9,100,000	---	---	460,000	---	460,000	---	460,000
[FC]	SUGAR CREEK BASIN, NC & SC.............................	27,300,000	141,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000
[BE]	WEST ONSLOW BEACH & NEW RIVER INLET, NC................	47,900,000	85,000	---	460,000	---	460,000	---	460,000
[N]	WILMINGTON HARBOR - NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVER, NC.....	9,480,000	900,000	---	206,000	---	206,000	---	206,000
[SP]	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH - NORTH PORTION, NC.................	450,000	68,000	132,000	---	132,000	---	132,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING	SENATE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	SENATE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	NORTH DAKOTA								
	DEVILS LAKE, ND	---	---	---	---	---	---	600,000	---
[FDP]	GRAND FORKS, ND	810,000	133,000	177,000	---	177,000	---	177,000	---
	OHIO								
[FC]	FAIRFIELD, OH	11,100,000	1,209,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
[FC]	HOLES CREEK AT WEST CARROLLTON AND MORAINE, OH	1,550,000	383,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
[FDP]	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, OH, KY & IN	1,120,000	801,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
[FDP]	OHIO RIVER COMPREHENSIVE STUDY	---	---	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
	OTTAWA RIVER, OH	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
[SPE]	TRUMBULL COUNTY, OH	350,000	110,000	40,000	---	40,000	---	40,000	---
[FC]	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	23,163,000	877,000	---	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---	1,400,000
	OKLAHOMA								
[FDP]	CRUTCHO CREEK, OK	650,000	280,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
[FC]	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK	11,900,000	1,232,000	---	168,000	---	168,000	---	168,000
	KAW DAM TO KEYSTONE LAKE BANK STABILIZATION, OK	---	---	---	---	350,000	---	---	---
[FDP]	MIAMI, OK & VICINITY	720,000	540,000	105,000	---	105,000	---	105,000	---
	OREGON								
[N]	COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL DEEPENING STUDY, OR & WA	1,580,000	580,000	100,000	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
[MP]	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	1,150,000	---	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000
[FDP]	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR	625,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
[N]	COOS BAY, OR [DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION]	538,000	503,000	35,000	---	35,000	---	35,000	---
[FDP]	JOHNSON CREEK, OR	532,000	288,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
[FDP]	WALLA WALLA RIVER, OR & WA	530,000	---	---	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
[FDP]	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW STUDY, OR	1,575,000	286,000	314,000	---	314,000	---	314,000	---
	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL -SEC. 1135-2	---	---	---	---	---	---	400,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA								
[FDP]	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	248,000	171,000	77,000	---	77,000	---	77,000	---
[FDP]	JUNIATA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, PA	320,000	60,000	60,000	---	60,000	---	60,000	---
[FDP]	LACKAWANNA RIVER, PA	1,260,000	1,215,000	45,000	---	45,000	---	45,000	---
[FC]	LACKAWANNA RIVER, PA	---	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
[N]	LOCK AND DAM 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	240,000,000	---	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000
[FDP]	POTTSTOWN [SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN], PA	600,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
[FDP]	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	420,000	166,000	165,000	---	165,000	---	165,000	---
[FDP]	READING [SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN], PA	600,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	100,000	---
[FC]	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	6,300,000	572,000	---	310,000	---	310,000	---	310,000
	SAW MILL RUN BASIN, PA	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
[FDP]	WYOMING VALLEY, PA - INFLATABLE DAM	625,000	100,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	WYOMING VALLEY LEVEE RAISING, PA	---	---	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	---
	PUERTO RICO								
[N]	GUAYANES, LAS MAREAS AND GUAYANILLA HARBORS, PR	355,000	58,000	77,000	---	77,000	---	77,000	---
[FC]	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	34,100,000	599,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000
[FDP]	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	445,000	229,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
[FC]	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	161,500,000	5,325,000	---	675,000	---	675,000	---	675,000
[N]	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	57,200,000	428,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000

Choctawhatchee and Pea River Basin, AL and FL.—The Committee is aware of recent flooding in the in the Pea River Basin in Alabama and has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of the flood control, water supply, and other water resource needs in the basin.

Bethel, AK.—An appropriation of $270,000 is included for the Corps of Engineers to complete preconstruction engineering and design and to begin plans and specifications for measures to correct erosion at Bethel, AK.

Little River County, AR.—An amount of $200,000 is included in the bill for the Corps to undertake a reconnaissance level study to determine whether a levee along the Little River County side of the Red River in Arkansas is justified as a result of recent flooding in the area.

Pinal County, AZ.—The Committee recommendation includes $250,000 for the Corps to initiate and complete a section 205 flood control study in Pinal County, AZ, between Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan areas.

Maricopa County regional EIS (watercourse water planning), AZ.—The Committee is aware of the desire of interests to develop a regional perspective in watercourse planning for the evaluation of cumulative impacts of development on the flood plain of the Gila River and its tributaries in Maricopa County, AZ. The Committee directs the Corps to use $200,000 of available funds to participate in a joint, cost-shared watercourse water planning effort with the Flood Control District of Maricopa County, AZ, and other State and Federal agencies.

Caliente Creek, CA.—The Committee has been advised that preconstruction engineering and design for the Caliente Creek project has been discontinued due to issues raised regarding the feasibility report. In order to resolve those issues the Committee has concurred with the House in providing $250,000 for the Corps to continue and complete feasibility phase studies.

Perry Creek, IA.—The Committee is aware that the Iowa Legislature has passed special legislation that will allow Sioux City, IA, to raise the required funds necessary to finalize an acceptable financial plan for the Perry Creek, IA, local protection project. Therefore, the Committee has provided an increase of $385,000 over the budget request of $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preparation of the feature design memorandum for the project and to initiate studies to determine the presence of hazardous and toxic materials.

Olmstead Lock and Dam, IL and KY.—The Committee recommendation included an additional $2,000,000 over the budget request of $3,532,000, for the Corps to expedite work on the lock design memorandum and plans and specification for the Olmstead Lock and Dam, IL and KY, project.

Louisiana Comprehensive Coastal Wetlands Study, LA.—The Committee has provided an additional $467,000 for the Louisiana Comprehensive Coastal Wetlands Study to allow the Corps to undertake more activities and so critical surveys can be accomplished as part of the feasibility study. The purpose of this study is to develop a comprehensive plan for dealing with Louisiana's coastal wetland loss problem by bringing the various causes of wetland loss, the numerous Federal, State, and local agencies, and the many studies and proposed solutions, under one umbrella study.

Mermentau, Vermillion, and Calcasieu Rivers and Bayou Tech, LA.—The Committee has provided an additional $200,000 over the budget request for the Mermentau, Vermillion, and Calcasieu Rivers and Bayou Tech, LA, study for the Corps to undertake a reconnaissance level investigation of the need to improve maintenance and/or enlarge the existing navigation channel from Cameron, LA, via the old channel of the Calcasieu River.

Bayou Latanier, Krotz Springs, LA.—The Committee has been advised of the serious drainage and pollution problems on Bayou Latanier at Krotz Springs, LA. The Corps of Engineers is directed to work with the State and local governments to provide a plan of improvement and solution and to take such steps as necessary to alleviate the situation.

Baltimore Harbor and channels, MD.—An appropriation of $150,000 is recommended for the Baltimore Harbor and channels, MD, project for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of the need to improve existing anchorage areas, and to investigate the need of providing or improving access channels to public terminal complexes in the harbor area.

New Jersey shore protection study. NJ.—The Committee has included $700,000 for the New Jersey shore protection study. The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 for reconnaissance studies of the Townsend Inlet to Cape May Inlet portion, and $500,000 for the Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Inlet reconnaissance study, which reflect the local priority.

Rochester Harbor, NY.—The Committee has recommended $200,000 for the Rochester Harbor project in New York for the Corps to begin a reconnaissance study of solutions to wave surge conditions occurring in the area.

Onondaga Lake, NY.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue reconnaissance level studies for the Onondaga Lake in New York.

Devils Lake, ND.—The Committee has provided $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete a 12-month study of an outlet for Devils Lake, incorporating the scope of study as described in a study resolution approved by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee dated March 27, 1990. Of that amount, up to $200,000 is available for reimbursement to the Bureau of Reclamation for its participation in the study.

Red River of the North, ND and MN.—Within available funds, the Corps is directed to use $250,000 to collect additional flooding data in the Red River basin and use that information to establish a coordinated Federal, State, and local approach for future studies and flood control assistance in the Red River Valley. This work is to be conducted under authority of section 50 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988.

Ohio River Basin Comprehensive Study.—The Committee is aware of the serious flooding and storms in eastern Ohio which killed over 20 people and caused extensive property damage. The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a comprehensive study to identify solutions to the recent flooding problems. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the

Chief of Engineers, is directed to use the authority of Senate resolution dated May 16, 1955, for the Ohio River Basin to conduct this investigation.

McKenzie River water temperature, OR.—The Committee has included an additional $400,000 under the Willamette River Basin review to expedite the review and evaluation of installing temperature control facilities at Blue River and Cougar Dams in the McKenzie River drainage. The feasibility study, which is to be completed in fiscal year 1992, should build on earlier efforts and not be delayed by the new comprehensive review study of the Willamette Basin project.

Columbia Slough/Johnson Creek, OR.—The Committee has included $250,000 and $140,000 to initiate and continue general investigations of Columbia Slough and Johnson Creek, respectively. Funds for Johnson Creek were included in the administration's budget request. The Committee is aware of the significant benefits of Columbia Slough and Johnson Creek to improving water quality, flood control, recreation, and wildlife habitat in the greater Portland, OR, metropolitan area and that related studies currently are being sponsored by several nonprofit organizations and municipal agencies. The Corps is encouraged to continue their cooperation with these local organizations to address the comprehensive benefits of these projects.

Mill Creek, TN.—The Committee has included $400,000 under general investigations for planning of the Mill Creek project near Nashville, TN. The Committee is aware that the project may not proceed because of local opposition. The city of Nashville and the State of Tennessee have requested that the Corps provide technical assistance in addressing pollution problems at Old Hickory, Percy Priest, and Cheatham Lakes and their associated tributaries. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Corps in the event the Mill Creek project is not reauthorized this year to utilize the $400,000 provided for planning of the project to conduct a regional environmental engineering study to identify and quantify point and nonpoint sources of pollution and associated sources that contribute to these pollution problems.

Cypress Creek, TX.—The Committee action concurs with the House in providing $750,000 for the Cypress Creek, TX, project in order that the Corps may continue preconstruction engineering and design. The project area was devastated by two major floods in May and June 1989 which emphasize the need to move work on the project ahead expeditiously.

Dallas floodway extension, TX.—The Committee allowance includes $350,000, the same as the House, to resume preconstruction engineering and design of the Dallas floodway extension project. This area too was subject to sever flooding in May 1990 and the Committee expects the Corps to proceed expeditiously with work on this project.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Sargent Beach, TX.—An appropriation of $690,000, an increase of $190,000, is recommended for the Sargent Beach, TX, portion of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway project. The Committee understands the importance of the work to the integrity of the entire western portion of the Intracoastal Canal. However, the Committee believes that it would be premature to initiate engineering and design in advance of the completion of feasibility studies.

The Committee has also recommended $160,000 to begin engineering and design on the Sargent Beach project.

Trinity River Basin comprehensive study, TX.—The Committee has included $900,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a comprehensive study of the flood control needs along the Trinity River in Texas. Recent floods devastated 54 counties in Texas along the Trinity River causing more than $300,000,000 in damages in the upper Trinity Basin. Estimates of damages in the lower and middle Trinity Basin have not been completed, but will be extensive. The funds recommended will allow the Corps to begin surveys and examinations of flood protection with specific attention to those areas of Texas devastated by these recent floods.

Connecticut River Basin, Townshend and Ball Mountain Dams, VT.—The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 for the Connecticut River Basin, Townshend, and Ball Mountain Dams project in Vermont, the full capability of the Corps of Engineers to complete preconstruction engineering and design on the project in 1991.

Section 22 planning assistance to States.—An amount of $4,500,000 is recommended for section 22 planning assistance to States, which is the same as the budget request.

The Committee received requests to earmark the maximum $300,000 for technical assistance from 11 States. This would require that $3,300,000 of the $4,500,000 budgeted for the entire Nation be earmarked for just a few States. Each year the number of States seeking the maximum $300,000 increases and if each of the 50 States received the maximum authorized, $15,000,000 would be required annually to fund this program. This is an increase of $10,500,000 of the 1991 level.

The Committee has been unable to find additional funds because of severe budget limitations to increase the funding level or allow the earmarking of funds. The Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Public Law 99-662, initiated cost sharing on Corps of Engineers programs and projects, and the Committee believes that cost sharing should be considered as proposed in the budget.

Pikeville Pond, KY.—The Committee has been made aware of a serious health hazard as a result of drainage problems and pollution at Pikevillle Pond, Pikeville, KY. In the absence of an authorized project under the Corps mission, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to provide technical assistance and to take other such steps necessary to assist the city in correcting this health hazard.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1990	$1,083,811,000
Budget estimate, 1991	1,226,000,000
House allowance	1,362,025,000
Committee recommendation	1,308,043,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,308,043,000 for construction of water resource projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended. Immediately following the table, the Committee has outlined special reductions and changes made in the budgeted projects together with selected other Committee actions.

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	SOUTH CAROLINA								
[BE]	FOLLY BEACH, SC	9,430,000	651,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	800,000
[BE]	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	60,131,000	257,000	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000
[SP]	SOUTH CAROLINA SHORES, SC	1,407,000	507,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA								
[FDP]	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	361,000	267,000	94,000	---	94,000	---	94,000	---
[FDP]	JAMES RIVER BASIN, SD	602,000	371,000	186,000	---	186,000	---	186,000	---
[FDP]	VERMILLION RIVER BASIN, SD	602,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
[FDP]	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	522,000	424,000	98,000	---	98,000	---	98,000	---
[FC]	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	3,150,000	---	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
	TENNESSEE								
[FDP]	METROPOLITAN CHATTANOOGA-HAMILTON CO., TN	1,500,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
[FC]	MILL CREEK, TN	7,500,000	160,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
	TEXAS								
[FDP]	ABILENE, TX [BRAZOS RIVER BASIN]	490,000	448,000	42,000	---	42,000	---	42,000	---
[FC]	ABILENE, TX [BRAZOS RIVER BASIN]	48,600,000	---	---	258,000	---	258,000	---	258,000
[FC]	BEAL'S CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX	7,000,000	767,000	---	145,000	---	145,000	---	145,000
[FDP]	BOSQUE RIVER WATERSHED, TX	250,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
[FC]	BRAYS BAYOU [HOUSTON], TX	165,000,000	214,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000
[N]	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX [42-FOOT PROJECT]	23,200,000	1,835,000	---	215,000	---	215,000	---	215,000
[N]	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	16,400,000	491,000	---	184,000	---	184,000	---	184,000
	CYPRESS CREEK, TX	---	---	---	---	---	750,000	---	750,000
[MP]	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, TX	68,000,000	1,184,000	---	---	---	350,000	---	350,000
[FC]	FALFURRIAS, TX	18,900,000	171,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
[FC]	FIVE MILE CREEK, DALLAS, TX	17,900,000	149,000	---	135,000	---	135,000	---	135,000
[RCP]	GIWW-ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	1,640,000	289,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
[RCP]	GIWW-SARGENT BEACH, TX	1,140,000	290,000	500,000	---	690,000	160,000	690,000	160,000
[FC]	GREENS BAYOU [HOUSTON], TX	101,000,000	214,000	---	723,000	---	723,000	---	723,000
[N]	HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	237,400,000	428,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
[FC]	LOWER RIO GRANDE, ARROYO COLORADO, TX	4,400,000	124,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
[FC]	LOWER RIO GRANDE, SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	115,000,000	43,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000
[SP]	MATAGORDA COUNTY SHORE, TX	590,000	100,000	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
[N]	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	790,000	514,000	276,000	---	276,000	---	276,000	---
[FC]	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX	8,200,000	286,000	---	300,000	---	643,000	---	300,000
[N]	PORT LAVACA TO RED BLUFF, TX	400,000	43,000	77,000	---	77,000	---	77,000	---
	RED RIVER WW., SHREVEPORT, LA TO DAINGERFIELD, TX	---	---	---	---	---	1,900,000	---	---
[FDP]	SAN BERNARD RIVER WATERSHED, TX	620,000	210,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
[FC]	SHOAL CREEK, AUSTIN, TX	66,000,000	190,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000
[COMP]	TRINITY RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE	900,000	---	---	---	---	---	900,000	---
[FDP]	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	3,070,000	780,000	650,000	---	650,000	---	650,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	UTAH								
[FC]	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT..................................	5,800,000	200,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
[FDP]	WEBER RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, UT........................	1,000,000	350,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	VERMONT								
[SPEC]	CONNECUTICUT RIVER BASIN, TOWNSEND AND GALL MTN. DAMS..	300,000	100,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000
	VIRGINIA								
[RCP]	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA........................	650,000	143,000	223,000	---	223,000	---	223,000	---
[FC]	BUENA VISTA [LP], VA...................................	38,900,000	143,000	---	600,000	---	1,695,000	---	1,695,000
[N]	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA................................	700,000	438,000	262,000	---	262,000	---	262,000	---
[FDP]	UPPER JAMES RIVER BASIN, VA & WV.......................	750,000	119,000	131,000	---	131,000	---	131,000	---
	WASHINGTON								
[FC]	CENTRALIA, WA..	18,600,000	1,321,000	---	464,000	---	464,000	---	464,000
[FC]	CHEHALIS RIVER, WA (SOUTH ABERDEEN, COSMOPOLIS)........	8,700,000	828,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM MODIFICATION, WA......................	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
[RCP]	HOWARD HANSON DAM, ADDITIONAL WATER STORAGE, WA........	237,000	195,000	42,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
[COMP]	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA. (WATER SUPPLY)..........	250,000	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---
[FDP]	LOWER SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA..............................	479,000	150,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
[N]	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA.....................................	579,000	503,000	76,000	---	76,000	---	76,000	---
[FDP]	TRI-CITIES LEVEES, WA..................................	925,000	150,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA								
[FC]	CABIN CREEK LPP, WV....................................	11,450,000	250,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
[FC]	ISLAND CREEK BASIN IN AND AROUND LOGAN, WV.............	67,065,000	362,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
[N]	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV...........................	7,785,000	6,023,000	650,000	---	650,000	---	650,000	---
[FDP]	LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER BASIN, WV.........................	1,100,000	393,000	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
[FC]	MOOREFIELD, WV...	---	150,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	1,000,000
[FC]	PETERSBURG, WV...	---	500,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	1,000,000
[SPE]	WEST VIRGINIA COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, WV (OHIO RIV MI 40-	1,000,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	WISCONSIN								
[RCP]	FOX RIVER, WI..	725,000	415,000	310,000	---	310,000	---	310,000	---
[N]	FOX RIVER CHANNEL GREEN BAY, WI........................	---	71,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000
[FDP]	MILWAUKEE METROPOLITAN AREA, WI........................	700,000	95,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
[FC]	PORTAGE, WI..	5,330,000	586,000	---	414,000	---	414,000	---	414,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS								
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	---	---	10,250,000	---	10,250,000	---	10,250,000	---
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA								
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	---	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA SYSTEMS	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	FEDERAL STRATEGY FOR AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE	---	---	350,000	---	1,000,000	---	350,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	---	---	9,000,000	---	9,000,000	---	9,000,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	---	---	280,000	---	280,000	---	280,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	---	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
	NATIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT DURING DROUGHT	---	---	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	---	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	---	---	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	---	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	---	---	850,000	---	850,000	---	850,000	---
	TOTAL			18,560,000	---	19,210,000	---	18,560,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	---	---	30,700,000	---	30,700,000	---	30,700,000	---
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			90,747,000	59,415,000	111,262,000	73,297,000	108,890,000	70,757,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	---	-14,762,000	---	-16,712,000	---	-26,312,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			135,400,000		167,847,000		153,335,000	

TYPE OF PROJECT:

[N]	NAVIGATION
[FC]	FLOOD CONTROL
[BE]	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
[MP]	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
[FDP]	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
[SP]	SHORELINE PROTECTION
[SPEC]	SPECIAL
[COMP]	COMPREHENSIVE
[RDP]	RESTUDY OF DEFERRED PROJECT
[RCP]	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECT
[PHASE I]	AUTHORIZED FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA					
[N]	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	2,309,000	230,000	95,000	95,000	95,000
[N]	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL &	66,000,000	200,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
[FC]	THREEMILE CREEK, MOBILE, AL	16,691,000	5,416,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
[FC]	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY, AL	31,965,000	11,237,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
[N]	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK AND DAM, AL	111,000,000	84,010,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
	ALASKA					
[N]	KODIAK HARBOR, AK	16,925,000	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
	ARIZONA					
[FC]	CLIFTON, AZ	11,000,000	---	---	---	2,700,000
[FC]	PHOENIX ARIZONA AND VICINITY, AZ [STAGE 2]	231,000,000	170,350,000	34,300,000	34,300,000	34,300,000
	ARKANSAS					
[MP]	BEAVER LAKE, AR	4,820,000	1,085,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
[FC]	FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, LITTLE ROCK, AR	19,100,000	10,876,000	6,900,000	6,900,000	6,900,000
[N]	MCCLELLAN-KERR AR RIVER NAV. SYSTEM, LOCKS AND DAMS, A	584,800,000	561,591,000	8,500,000	9,900,000	8,500,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & LA	---	---	---	4,100,000	2,000,000
	CALIFORNIA					
[FC]	CACHE CREEK SETTLING BASIN, CA	14,700,000	5,829,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
[FC]	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	17,700,000	11,424,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
[FC]	DRY CREEK [WARM SPRINGS] LAKE, CA	361,500,000	321,495,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
[FC]	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS, CA	13,800,000	11,055,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000
[FC]	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	52,300,000	2,550,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
	HANSEN DAM, CA	---	---	---	272,000	272,000
[FC]	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	70,500,000	10,302,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
[MP]	NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	394,500,000	361,151,000	2,000,000	3,500,000	2,000,000
[N]	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	54,200,000	9,866,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
[FC]	PAJARO RIVER, CA	7,395,000	5,395,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
[FC]	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEK, CA	50,400,000	18,988,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
[N]	REDONDO BEACH [KING HARBOR], CA	5,135,000	785,000	---	4,350,000	4,350,000
[N]	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	12,550,000	3,424,000	---	900,000	---
[FC]	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	98,600,000	79,015,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
[N]	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	21,400,000	4,362,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
[FC]	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CA	82,215,000	74,825,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT [GCID], CA	500,000	---	---	500,000	500,000
[FC]	SACRAMENTO URBAN AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	21,800,000	4,800,000	13,470,000	13,470,000	13,470,000
	SAN DIEGO RIVER & MISSION BAY, CA	975,000	---	---	975,000	---
[N]	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	123,800,000	56,864,000	2,050,000	2,050,000	2,050,000
[FC]	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA	33,000,000	13,873,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
[FC]	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	908,000,000	45,635,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000
	SANTA PAULA CREEK CHANNEL, CA	37,400,000	---	---	200,000	---
[FC]	SWEETWATER RIVER, CA	31,200,000	23,049,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
[FC]	WALNUT CREEK, CA	67,900,000	63,100,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
[FC]	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	25,400,000	12,403,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000

Montgomery Point Lock, McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, AR.—The Committee recognizes the importance of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system and also recognizes that the construction of a lock and dam at the system's entrance at Montgomery Point may be essential for the navigation system to remain a reliable, efficient method of transportation for private and military cargo.

The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to complete the ongoing Arkansas River Basin comprehensive study, and the necessary detail engineering studies for the lock at Montgomery Point at the earliest possible time. Because these engineering studies are critical to decisions related to environmental questions, and project scope and cost the Committee has deferred, without prejudice, a decision of construction.

Mill Creek, Fort Smith, AR.—In 1988, the Congress provided funding to begin construction of the Mill Creek, Fort Smith, AR, project under the section 205 program of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee directs that sufficient continuing funding be provided for the project in fiscal 1991 if needed.

Salmon River, ID, (frazzle ice research).—The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers has committed to provide funding under the section 205 program for continued testing of frazzle ice control structures on the Salmon River in Idaho. If appropriate weather conditions exist, the Committee expects and directs the Corps to provide sufficient funding to complete the frazzle ice research on the Salmon River in Salmon, ID, and to present a report on progress and results during the fiscal year 1992 budget presentation.

Olmstead Locks and Dam, IL and KY.—The Committee is aware of the need to provide a replacement structure for the existing locks and dams 52 and 53 on the Ohio River. In acting on the appropriations bill for fiscal 1991, the House moved the budgeted planning and design money to the "Construction, General" account and added an additional $1,468,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate land acquisition. The Committee understands that additional funds for land acquisition will not advance initiation of project construction, but that the Corps could effectively use additional funding to expedite the lock design memorandum and other activities.

The Committee has, therefore, provided under general investigations a total of $5,532,000, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request, for the Corps to expedite on work on the lock design memorandum and plans and specifications. If the Corps is able to use additional funding beyond that recommended in fiscal 1991, the Committee expects the Corps to use its reprogramming authority to make additional resources available.

Mississippi River ship channel, LA.—The recent report of the Lower Mississippi Delta Commission identified completion of phase II of the 45-foot ship channel from the Gulf of Mexico to Baton Rouge as a priority to the economic development of the region. The State of Louisiana is prepared to sign a cost-sharing agreement for this phase of the project.

The Committee has included an additional $5,500,000 to begin dredging of the navigation channel from mile 181 to Baton Rouge.

The Committee urges the Corps to work with the dredging industry to ensure that adequate dredging equipment is available to maintain the channel once it is completed.

Mississippi River/gulf outlet, LA.—Pursuant to the development of a replacement lock at the Industrial Canal site in New Orleans, LA, the Corps of Engineers in conjunction with the local project sponsors is directed to implement a community participation process with affected residential, business, and governmental entities. The historical nature and uniqueness of the urban environment dictate that a broad-based community process is necessary. Such process shall include involvement of representatives of existing community associations and business groups in the areas adjacent to the Industrial Canal as well as representatives of local government. The Corps shall designate an advisory group for the purposes of exchanging information and receiving community opinions and advising the district engineer on various aspects of the project.

The Corps, in conjunction with the local project sponsor, shall develop a comprehensive plan to identify and mitigate to the maximum extent practicable any adverse social and cultural impacts of the project. Such plan shall include measures to provide adequate replacement housing, street circulation, and enhanced neighborhood amenities to insure that communities adjacent to the project remain as complete, liveable neighborhoods during and after construction of the project. In the evaluation of benefits for implementing such plan, the benefits attributed to measures included in the project for the purpose of cultural and social mitigation and enhancement shall be deemed to be at least equal to the cost of such measures.

The preservation of historic properties and the evaluation of the impact of civil works projects on areas deemed to be of historical significance is addressed in the Corps' regulations on the subject. The Committee expects the Corps to strictly follow these guidelines in evaluating the impact of the replacement of the Industrial Canal lock.

The Water Resources Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–662) requires consultation on this project with affected local communities and efforts to "assure full participation of members of minority groups living in the affected areas" in the replacement of the lock. The act requires the Secretary of the Army to report annually on the implementation of these provisions. The Committee expects full compliance with these requirements.

The Corps shall give maximum consideration to lock replacement alternatives which minimizes residential and business disruption while meeting the goals or improving waterborne commerce.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, LA.—The Committee has included a total of $92,636,000 to continue construction of the Red River Waterway project in Louisiana. The additional funds have been provided to continue construction of locks and dams 4 and 5, to repair damages caused by the 1990 floods to project features that are complete or currently under construction, and to initiate the following continuing contracts in fiscal year 1991 which are not to be considered fully funded: Grappe Capout, Fausse Capout, Socot Capout, Grappe Realignment, McDade Revet-

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	COLORADO					
[FC]	WESTERLY CREEK, CO....................................	8,500,000	7,258,000	1,242,000	1,242,000	1,242,000
	DELAWARE					
[FC]	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE.........................	10,300,000	3,816,000	130,000	130,000	130,000
	FLORIDA					
[N]	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL..................................	18,300,000	12,679,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
[FC]	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL......................	930,000,000	354,238,000	18,800,000	18,800,000	18,800,000
[FC]	DADE COUNTY, FL.......................................	50,900,000	38,854,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
	DUVALL COUNTY, FL.....................................	27,800,000	---	---	2,400,000	---
[N]	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL................................	5,120,000	---	---	2,500,000	---
[FC]	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL.................................	160,000,000	71,256,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL..................................	22,300,000	3,944,000	---	6,000,000	2,000,000
[BE]	MANATEE COUNTY, FL....................................	21,300,000	5,115,000	2,320,000	2,320,000	2,320,000
[BE]	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL...................................	63,600,000	13,189,000	2,500,000	6,500,000	2,500,000
[BE]	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL...................................	31,800,000	2,481,000	2,067,000	2,067,000	2,067,000
	TAMPA BAY [PORT SUTTON], FL...........................	1,155,000	107,000	---	500,000	500,000
	GEORGIA					
[FC]	OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA......................	9,900,000	6,633,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
[MP]	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC..............	549,000,000	508,051,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
	HAWAII					
	KAWAIHAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI..........................	---	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
[N]	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI..............................	6,820,000	987,000	4,450,000	4,450,000	4,450,000
	ILLINOIS					
[FC]	ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICTS, IL & MO......	107,080,000	91,582,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
[FC]	EAST ST. LOUIS, IL....................................	31,965,000	3,661,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,580,000
[FC]	LOVES PARK, IL..	18,680,000	1,505,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
[N]	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO....................	742,400,000	649,129,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000
[N]	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, SECOND LOCK, IL & MO.......	230,000,000	71,514,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
[FC]	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL........................	18,800,000	14,367,000	4,433,000	4,433,000	4,433,000
[FC]	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL..................................	15,000,000	2,557,000	---	4,300,000	4,300,000
	OLMSTEAD LOCKS & DAM, IL & KY.........................	495,000,000	3,768,000	---	5,000,000	---
[N]	UPPER MISS RIVER SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROG, IL, IA, MO, MN.	154,514,000	28,650,000	14,900,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
	INDIANA					
[FC]	EVANSVILLE, IN..	51,100,000	38,807,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
[FC]	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN..............................	51,400,000	3,708,000	3,390,000	3,390,000	3,390,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	IOWA					
	DES MOINES RECREATION RIVER & GREENBELT, IA............	10,500,000	4,195,000	---	550,000	550,000
[FC]	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS, & MO.........	114,416,000	89,635,000	905,000	905,000	905,000
	RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE, IA.............................	33,600,000	3,750,000	---	3,000,000	3,000,000
	KANSAS					
[FC]	GREAT BEND, KS..	27,200,000	10,320,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
[FC]	HALSTEAD, KS..	6,600,000	1,126,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
	KENTUCKY					
	SALYERSVILLE, KY......................................	7,406,000	---	---	400,000	---
[FC]	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY...................................	99,385,000	92,810,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
	LOUISIANA					
[FC]	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA...........................	18,677,000	15,732,000	2,659,000	2,659,000	2,659,000
[FC]	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA [HURRICANE PROTECT	423,000,000	251,617,000	11,655,000	11,655,000	11,655,000
[FC]	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA [HURRICANE PROTECTION]....	70,700,000	58,468,000	4,210,000	4,210,000	4,210,000
[N]	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA...................	523,000,000	92,263,000	1,157,000	1,157,000	1,157,000
[N]	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	148,000,000	11,431,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	11,000,000
[FC]	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA [HURRICANE PROTECTION]......	160,000,000	97,077,000	15,900,000	15,900,000	15,900,000
[FC]	PEARL RIVER, SLIDELL, ST. TAMMANY PARISH, LA..........	19,900,000	2,697,000	730,000	730,000	730,000
[N]	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,724,000,000	1,101,428,000	39,147,000	61,636,000	92,636,000
[FC]	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LEVEE AND BANK STABILIZATI	63,076,000	60,944,000	---	---	3,820,000
[FC]	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA [HURRICANE PROTECTION]..	55,200,000	3,135,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
	MARYLAND					
[BE]	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD........................	192,000,000	10,725,000	14,800,000	14,800,000	14,800,000
	MICHIGAN					
	LOWER AND MIDDLE ROUGE RIVERS, MI.....................	---	---	---	3,000,000	---
	MINNESOTA					
[FC]	BASSETT CREEK, MN.....................................	29,000,000	18,382,000	8,505,000	8,505,000	8,505,000
[FC]	CHASKA, MN..	24,400,000	7,094,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
[N]	DULUTH SUPERIOR CHANL EXTENSION, MN & WI..............	7,786,000	768,000	---	1,000,000	---
	HEARDING ISLAND INLET, DULUTH HARBOR, MN..............	500,000	---	---	500,000	---
[FC]	ROCHESTER, MN...	64,200,000	19,211,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
	ST. PAUL, MN..	7,160,000	1,838,000	---	500,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	MISSISSIPPI					
	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	29,800,000	2,145,000	---	100,000	100,000
[FC]	SOWASHEE CREEK, MERIDIAN, MS	13,520,000	8,369,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
[FC]	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	38,364,000	25,098,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	MISSOURI					
[FC]	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	175,000,000	39,421,000	10,100,000	10,100,000	10,100,000
	BRUSH CREEK, KANSAS CITY, MO	16,100,000	2,100,000	---	1,240,000	1,240,000
[FC]	CAPE GIRARDEAU-JACKSON, MO	24,880,000	3,193,000	7,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000
[FC]	HANNIBAL, MO	5,080,000	3,470,000	1,460,000	1,460,000	1,460,000
[MP]	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	549,000,000	538,790,000	3,495,000	3,495,000	3,495,000
	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN [VALLEY PARK LEVEE], MO	9,940,000	145,000	---	500,000	---
[N]	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS [REG WORKS], MO	207,000,000	146,483,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
	NEBRASKA					
[FC]	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	21,000,000	1,531,000	83,000	1,060,000	1,060,000
[FC]	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	59,500,000	53,698,000	2,905,000	2,905,000	2,905,000
	PLATTE RIVER FLOOD & RELATED STREAMBANK EROSION CONTROL PORGRAM, NE	4,000,000	---	---	1,500,000	1,500,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE					
[N]	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME	16,725,000	14,055,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
	NEW JERSEY					
[N]	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	31,100,000	24,003,000	5,537,000	5,537,000	5,537,000
[BE]	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	65,800,000	4,368,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
[N]	DELAWARE RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF CAMDEN, NJ[BECKETT S	3,540,000	250,000	---	3,290,000	3,290,000
[FC]	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET & PECK BEACH, NJ	269,000,000	766,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000
[BE]	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	633,000,000	13,077,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000
	NEW MEXICO					
[FC]	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	51,300,000	5,650,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
[FC]	ALBUQUERQUE NORTH DIVERSION CHANNEL, NM	19,520,000	17,570,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
[FC]	MIDDLE RIO GRANGE, BERNALILLO TO BELEN, NM	44,600,000	1,177,000	---	---	1,300,000
[FC]	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES UNIT, NM	10,200,000	8,783,000	1,417,000	1,417,000	1,417,000
	NEW YORK					
	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY, PT.I, NY	---	---	---	---	350,000
[BE]	FIRE ISLAND INLET-JONES INLET,NY 1962 ACT	218,300,000	9,300,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
[N]	HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, NY	4,400,000	1,750,000	2,650,000	2,650,000	2,650,000
[N]	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ	268,600,000	80,433,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
[N]	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	11,400,000	6,019,000	---	3,000,000	3,000,000
[FC]	YONKERS, NY	13,529,000	13,019,000	355,000	355,000	355,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	NORTH CAROLINA					
[N]	AIWW-REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	68,300,000	24,283,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
[FC]	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	143,400,000	139,217,000	1,810,000	1,810,000	1,810,000
[FC]	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	16,450,000	9,374,000	1,190,000	1,190,000	1,190,000
[FC]	FALLS LAKE, NC	182,000,000	160,974,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	MANTEO [SHALLOWBAG] BAY, NC	---	---	---	182,000	182,000
	NORTH DAKOTA					
[FC]	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	43,500,000	9,168,000	8,900,000	8,900,000	8,900,000
[FC]	SOURIS RIVER BASIN, ND	92,600,000	49,538,000	25,400,000	25,400,000	25,400,000
	OHIO					
[FC]	MILL CREEK, OH	155,664,000	88,104,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
[FC]	SENECAVILLE LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH [DAM SAFET	2,450,000	1,561,000	835,000	835,000	835,000
	OKLAHOMA					
[FC]	MINGO CREEK, OK	101,300,000	17,170,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000
	TULSA & WEST TULSA, OK	---	---	---	300,000	975,000
	OREGON					
[N]	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA	328,000,000	151,900,000	69,000,000	69,000,000	69,000,000
[MP]	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA	679,000,000	658,428,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
[FC]	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	164,400,000	100,341,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
[FC]	WILLOW CREEK DAM, OR	37,318,000	37,168,000	---	---	150,000
	PENNSYLVANIA					
[N]	GRAYS LANDING, LOCK AND DAM 7, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	168,000,000	48,780,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
[FC]	LOCK HAVEN, PA	64,300,000	10,019,000	18,600,000	18,600,000	18,600,000
[N]	POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA &	96,400,000	20,406,000	28,300,000	28,300,000	28,300,000
[BE]	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA [PERMANENT]	16,400,000	8,100,000	4,170,000	4,170,000	4,170,000
[FC]	TURTLE CREEK, PA	17,301,000	16,365,000	936,000	936,000	936,000
	PUERTO RICO					
[FC]	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	339,000,000	235,752,000	18,200,000	18,200,000	18,200,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA					
[N]	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	71,001,000	25,156,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000
	TENNESSEE					
	CLARKSVILLE, TN STREAMBANK EROSION	1,100,000	---	---	---	550,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	TEXAS					
[FC]	CLEAR CREEK, TX	54,600,000	11,220,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
[FC]	BOGGY CREEK, AUSTIN, TX	16,700,000	14,437,000	2,263,000	2,263,000	2,263,000
[FC]	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	135,000,000	99,865,000	17,400,000	17,400,000	17,400,000
[FC]	EL PASO, TX	109,900,000	68,133,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
[N]	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	64,400,000	29,359,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
[FC]	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	188,300,000	187,222,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
[FC]	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS, TX	33,700,000	15,885,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
[N]	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX	29,600,000	27,100,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
[FC]	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	291,000,000	279,257,000	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
	RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX & OK	268,000,000	---	---	5,000,000	---
[FC]	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	115,000,000	103,463,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
[FC]	SIMS BAYOU AT HOUSTON, TX	178,400,000	4,348,000	12,600,000	12,600,000	12,600,000
[FC]	TAYLORS BAYOU, TX	38,400,000	27,672,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
[FC]	TEXAS CITY AND VICINITY, TX	40,400,000	39,552,000	848,000	848,000	848,000
[N]	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	75,000,000	29,844,000	---	9,200,000	---
	UTAH					
[FC]	LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT	32,700,000	23,630,000	9,070,000	9,070,000	9,070,000
	VIRGINIA					
[N]	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA	137,400,000	16,775,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
[FC]	RICHMOND, [LOCAL PROTECTION], VA	78,600,000	23,529,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
[FC]	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	19,900,000	2,224,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
	WASHINGTON					
[MP]	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS, WA	395,000,000	385,563,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
[MP]	COLUMBIA RIVER JUVENILE FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	139,000,000	25,079,000	15,800,000	17,500,000	18,500,000
[N]	GRAYS HARBOR, WA	46,300,000	16,348,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
[MP]	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	198,000,000	161,710,000	18,400,000	18,400,000	18,400,000
[FC]	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA [DAM SAFETY]	58,200,000	10,557,000	8,700,000	8,700,000	8,700,000
[FC]	ZINTEL CANYON DAM, WA	6,800,000	477,000	---	6,300,000	6,300,000
	WEST VIRGINIA					
[N]	GALLIPOLIS LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH	345,000,000	165,426,000	46,300,000	46,300,000	46,300,000
[FC]	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	764,000,000	270,776,000	36,800,000	64,800,000	70,800,000
[FC]	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	231,000,000	217,640,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
[N]	WINFIELD LOCK AND DAM, WV	203,000,000	27,934,000	16,200,000	16,200,000	16,200,000
	WISCONSIN					
[FC]	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES, WI	25,500,000	11,222,000	6,300,000	6,300,000	6,300,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	MISCELLANEOUS					
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL [1965 ACT]......................	---	---	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS [SECTION 103]..........	---	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION [SECTION 1	---	---	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION...............................	---	---	14,930,000	14,930,000	14,930,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS [SECTION 205]..................	---	---	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSES.........	---	---	25,000	25,000	25,000
	INLAND WATERWAY USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSES..........	---	---	160,000	160,000	160,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES [SECTION 111].............	---	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS [SECTION 107].....................	---	---	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	---	---	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	SMALL SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECTS [SECTION 208]....	---	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE........	---	---	-69,539,000	-69,239,000	-72,016,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED UNOBLIGATED BALANCES........	---	---	---	---	-59,175,000
				===============	===============	===============
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL.....................			1,226,000,000	1,362,025,000	1,308,043,000
				===============	===============	===============

TYPE OF PROJECT:

[N]	NAVIGATION
[FC]	FLOOD CONTROL
[BE]	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
[MP]	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

ment, Moss Revetment, Elm Grove Revetment, and Cecile Revetment.

Missouri River, Fort Yates Bridge, ND.—The Committee has included a provision in the bill which requires the Secretary of the Army to begin planning, engineering, and design of a highway bridge across the Missouri River at an appropriate location midway between Bismarck, ND, and Mobridge, SD. This work was originally authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1970; however, due to a number of circumstances, the work has not proceeded. The Committee believes that, in order to accomplish this work, the Army Corps of Engineers should be directed to proceed with construction upon completion of an LCA. Furthermore, the original authorization needs revision to reflect cost-sharing realities that now characterize Federal water resources development projects. Bismarck and Mobridge represent the location of existing bridge crossings over the Missouri River and Lake Oahe and are separated by more than 100 miles.

East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, part I, NY.—The Committee recommendation includes $350,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reanalysis of the East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, NY (Rockaway Beach), erosion project to determine the need for additional nourishment, and to negotiate a local cost sharing agreement.

Tulsa-west Tulsa local protection project, OK.—The Committee notes that in a September 1989 reconnaissance study report, funded by the Committee's fiscal year 1989 appropriations measure, the Corps reported that the 20 miles of levees which compose the Tulsa-west Tulsa local protection project could not sustain another major flood and that levee failure would be catastrophic in terms of property damage, potential for loss of life, and environmental destruction. Therefore, the Committee provides $975,000 in construction funds for the Tulsa-west Tulsa local protection project, the total project cost of which will be $1,300,000. The Committee authorizes the Corps to complete the necessary feasibility and environmental assessments, consummate a local cost-sharing agreement, and begin rehabilitation of the Tulsa-west Tulsa levee system.

Willow Creek Dam, OR.—The Committee has included the Federal share of $150,000 to construct improvements to recreation facilities at Willow Creek Dam in Oregon. The Committee understands that project sponsors have secured financing for the local cost share and have agreed to pay for annual operation and maintenance expenses as required by law.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland Rivers, Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia.—The Committee has amended the House bill to provide that $6,000,000 shall be used by the Corps of Engineers to undertake the lower Mingo County, WV, feature of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland Rivers project.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal 1991 also includes $7,500,000 for levee and floodwall construction, and structural and nonstructural work at Barbourville, KY; and $20,500,000 for the river diversion tunnel, and structural and nonstructural work at

Harlan, KY. These are the amounts needed by the Corps of Engineers in 1991 for activities at these two locations.

Columbia River Basin Fish Bypass Program.—The Committee strongly supports the program to install new and improved juvenile fish passage facilities at all the mainstem dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers as soon as possible. Given the importance of and the benefits to be derived from enhanced fish runs in the Columbia and Snake Rivers, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to proceed with fiscal year 1991 activities and again strongly urges the Secretary to place a higher budget priority on this work in fiscal year 1992 and beyond.

The Committee has provided funds totaling $18,500,000, which is $2,700,000 over the budget request. The funds recommended for 1991 are for design, testing, and construction of fish bypass facilities in the Columbia Basin. The Committee commends the administration for including funding in the fiscal 1991 budget for modifications to four Columbia River projects which will increase passage and survival of juvenile anadromous fish at the dams. Priority should be given to the development of extended length screens at McNary Dam and installation and operation of new bypass facilities at Lower Monumental Dam in time for the fish migration in the spring of 1992.

The Committee strongly supports the development, testing, and installation of bypass facilities at Ice Harbor and the Dalles Dams. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to obligate and expend the funds provided by the Committee to proceed with these two projects. A total amount of $1,600,000 is provided to complete plans and specifications and to start construction of screens and transport channels at Ice Harbor Dam. The Committee has provided another $1,100,000 to continue screen development, to perform model studies, and to continue the general design memorandum on the bypass system for the Dalles Dam.

The Committee has provided $1,000,000, as requested, for the Corps to undertake a mitigation analysis. The Corps is directed to proceed with this work in such a way that does not delay or stretchout the other activities outlined above and which recognizes the current importance of bypass for endangered salmon petitions pending in the region.

Small Flood Control Projects (Sec. 205).—Within available funds for section 103, Small Beach Erosion Control Program, the Corps is to undertake a reanalysis of the benefits and costs of the Orchard Beach, NY, beach erosion control project.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—The Committee recommendation for the Aquatic Plant Control Program included $150,000 for Eurasian milfoil control activities at Lake Champlain in Vermont and New York.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1990	$20,000,000
Budget estimate, 1991	25,000,000
House allowance	25,000,000
Committee recommendation	20,000,000

An appropriation of $20,000,000 is recommended for flood control and coastal emergencies.

This activity provides for flood emergency preparation, flood fighting and rescue operations, and repair of flood control and Federal hurricane and shore protection works. It also provides for emergency supplies of clean drinking water where the source has been contaminated and, in drought distressed areas, provision of adequate supplies of water for human and livestock consumption. In the event of a major flood or coastal emergency, additional funds will be requested.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriations, 1990	$331,296,000
Budget estimate, 1991	334,500,000
House allowance	342,731,000
Committee recommendation	338,993,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $338,993,000 for flood control activities along the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

Southeast Arkansas study, AR.—An additional $75,000 has been over the budget request for the Southeast Arkansas Study for the Corps to complete the Beouf-Tensas Basin comprehensive studies initiated in fiscal 1990.

West Memphis and vicinity, AR.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers and the local sponsor of the West Memphis, AR, flood control project have worked out the details of a project which, while smaller, provides acceptable levels of protection and can be cost shared by the city of West Memphis. Given the past history of flooding and destruction in the area, all are to be commended for their hard work to arrive at a solution to the problem.

The Committee believes that, because of the urgent need to alleviate widespread flooding in the area, it is imperative that the Corps proceed with the cost-shared project on an expedited schedule that provides for completion of the project at the earliest possible time. The project to be constructed should be consistent with the plan recommended in the general design memorandum 101 dated May 1990. To ensure that the project is expedited, the Committee has included language in the bill directing award of continuing contracts until completion and has recommended an appropriation of $2,000,000 for fiscal 1991.

Yazoo Basin restudy, MS.—The Committee has renamed the upper Yazoo Basin Reformulation Study as a restudy and provided the full $5,900,000 as requested in the budget. The Committee expects the restudy effort to remain within the project authorization and that all environmental requirements be met.

Water balance study, Yazoo Basin, MS.—In last year's report, this Committee directed the Corps of Engineers to complete the remaining phases of the water balance study for the northwest Mississippi region. In order to clarify this direction, the remaining phases, to include the feasibility studies, are to be completed under the terms in effect when the study was directed by this Committee in fiscal year 1984. Funding for the Upper Yazoo restudy may be utilized for this purpose.

Bayou Rapides Drainage Structure and Pumping Plant, LA.—The Committee is aware of the deteriorated condition of the Bayou Rapides Drainage Structure and Pump Station which is located within the lower Red River, South Bank Levee Project authorized by the Flood Control Act, May 15, 1928; Public Law 391, 70th Congress. The project consists of incorporation and enlargement of existing flood control features along the south bank levee alignment to provide protection to the area south and west of the Red River from Hotwells, LA, to Moncla, LA, including the city of Alexandria. This floodgate and pump station was constructed in 1935 along the alignment of the subject project levee to provide a control at the outlet of Bayou Rapides and to prevent flooding by Red River backwater.

Reviews by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Louisiana Department of Transportation, Office of Public Works; and the Red River, Atchafalaya and Bayou Boeuf Levee District determined that the structure has severe structural deterioration and obsolete pumping equipment. Failure during a project flood would be disastrous with regard to loss of life as well as property. The structure location is adjacent to Rapides General Hospital and the downtown area of Alexandria, LA. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to incorporate this structure into the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project, lower Red River, South Bank Levee and initiate needed repairs.

The Committee has included $200,000 for the Corps to begin engineering and design on this work.

Ouachita River Levees Project, LA.—The Committee recognizes the importance of the Ouachita River Levees Project to a large portion of central Louisiana. Failure of this levee system could result in loss of life, substantial property damage, and severe economic and social disruption in the Monroe-West Monroe area. The existing project was constructed about 50 years ago as a partnership between the Federal Government, represented by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the local people, represented by their sponsor, the Tensas Basin Levee District. The levees system is in serious need of rehabilitation, particularly with respect to badly deteriorated drainage structures that could cause failure of the flood protection system.

The Committee understands that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has approved a project to upgrade and rehabilitate this vital levee system with improvements to protect urban areas against the current flood threat. It is the opinion of the Committee that this project should proceed in an orderly but expeditious manner in accordance with the existing assurances of local cooperation and that the costs for rehabilitation or replacement of the deteriorated drainage structures in the levee be accomplished at Federal expense, including the Bawcomville portion of the protective system.

Funds in the amount of $400,000 have been added to the bill to initiate this work, and the Committee directs that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in cooperation with the local project sponsor develop a schedule for completion of this critical project.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds recommended with the budget request and the House allowance for activities and projects under this account.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1990	$1,398,219,000
Budget estimate, 1991	1,389,500,000
House allowance	1,457,488,000
Committee recommendation	1,408,791,000

An appropriation of $1,408,791,000 is recommended for the operation and maintenance activities of the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Committee fully recognizes the budget crises, yet believes that it is essential to provide adequate attention to operation and maintenance requirements in order to protect the large Federal investment. It should be pointed out that OMB has reduced this area by significantly over the past 3 years below the amount needed to adequately address program needs. Meanwhile, the Corps has been completing projects and adding them to the operational inventory each year. In order to cope with this situation, the Corps has had to defer or delay scheduled maintenance activities. If the trend in deferred maintenance continues unabated, Corps managed national infrastructure will experience accelerating deterioration until failure occurs. The Committee finds this situation unacceptable.

As alluded to earlier, the Committee is aware of growing operation and maintenance requirements nationwide, and the continuously changing needs and priorities. It is often necessary to accomplish work scheduled for the budget year in the current year, and it is not uncommon for the Corps to divert budgeted operation and maintenance funds to unscheduled work to meet unforeseen emergency requirements.

Further, the Committee is aware of the efforts of the Corps to stretch its scarce O&M dollars to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of methods. As more and more projects come into the inventory and budgetary constraints reduce available resources, it is clear the Corps will need to change its traditional approach to undertaking the required O&M work nationwide. Adjustments in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be considered in conjunction with efforts to optimize the use of the limited resources available and to maximum public benefits.

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, pool 2/Morgan Bendway.—The Committee directs the Corps' attention to the need to excavate the Arkansas-White River Canal to its full depth and to deposit the fill material resulting from this excavation at Morgan Bendway. This excavation is crucial if the Corps is to be able to operate pool 2 to move sediments through the system and to greatly reduce annual dredging costs. The Corps is directed to provide the necessary operation and maintenance funds for this purpose.

Heber Springs, AR.—With the construction of Greers Ferry Lake in 1961, the city of Heber Springs, AR, lost its water supply along the Little Red River. Since this time, the Corps of Engineers and the city of Heber Springs have been negotiating a reasonable amount of compensation for the city. The city has been getting water from Greers Ferry Lake in exchange for the water supply lost with its construction. The Committee directs the Secretary to allow for the free use of water currently withdrawn by the city on an average annual basis, and also to establish an amount to be used free of cost that will cover the reasonable growth of the city until the year 2000.

Oceanside, CA.—An amount of $2,700,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to proceed with operation, monitoring, and to initiate design of phase III of the experimental sand bypass system at Oceanside, CA. The Committee understands that the system has passed all initial tests and is operating more efficiently than anticipated by the Corps.

Brunswick Harbor, GA.—The Committee has provided $7,533,000 for maintenance dredging at Brunswick Harbor, GA, and directs the Corps of Engineers to use these funds to place suitable dredged material on the beach of St. Simons Island in cooperation with local interests in accordance with the provisions of section 933 of Public Law 99-662.

Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, MD and DE.—The Committee has provided $7,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to begin construction of a new bridge over the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal at St. Georges, DE.

The Committee is aware of the questions and issues related to the authority of the Corps of Engineers to build a bridge at St. Georges, DE. On May 25, 1990, the Committee on Environment and Public Works informed the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee of its views of the detailed history and documentation of the project, including the original charter of the Chesapeake and Delaware Co., and its conclusion that the Corps of Engineers currently possesses the legal authority to construct and fund a replacement crossing for the existing St. Georges Bridge. In addition, that Committee's views on this matter are contained in Senate Report 101-333 accompanying the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 addressed the authority of the Corps of Engineers to construct a new bridge and reaffirmed the authority of the United States, through the Army Corps of Engineers, to build a replacement bridge at St. Georges.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps to proceed on a expedited basis to use the funds provided in the bill to construct a new bridge to accommodate projected traffic loads along Route 13 according to the design which has been developed by the Delaware Department of Transportation in consultation with the Corps of Engineers.

Fort Peck and Lake, MT.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Fort Peck Dam and Lake project for construction of a breakwater at the Fort Peck marina and to make improvements in existing boat ramps and recreational areas.

Ohio River Locks and Dams, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA, and WV.—The recommendation for the Ohio River Locks and Dams project includes $1,000,000 for the Corps to expand existing parking facilities and river access points at the Huntington Riverfront Park in West Virginia.

Charleston Waterfront Park, WV.—The Committee recommendation includes $350,000 for the Corps to continue the 50 percent cost-shared Charleston Waterfront Park, WV, project in 1991.

Rehabilitation of hydroelectric powerplants.—The Committee shares the concern expressed in the House Committee report regarding policy changes under consideration by the Secretary of the

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
	SURVEYS:				
	GENERAL STUDIES:				
[FC]	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION [COMPREHENSIVE STUDY], AR.	2,638,000	430,000	430,000	430,000
[FC]	HELENA ARKANSAS AND VICINITY, AR..................	13,300,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
[FDP]	SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS STUDY, AR......................	760,000	75,000	75,000	150,000
[FC]	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR..............................	4,430,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
[FDP]	ALEXANDRIA, LA....................................	1,220,000	---	300,000	300,000
[FDP]	BIRDS POINT, NEW MADRID ALTERNATE STUDY, MO.......	1,430,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
[FDP]	ST. FRANCIS RIVER MO. & AR. [FISH AND WILDLIFE]...	1,120,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
[FC]	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA................	---	295,000	295,000	295,000
[FC]	PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:				
	BAYOU RAPIDES DRAINAGE STRUCTURE & PUMP PLANT......	---	---	---	200,000
	LOWER WHITE RIVER [BIG CREEK AND TRIBS], AR.......	45,100,000	385,000	385,000	385,000
	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY, LA..................	1,200,000	---	300,000	300,000
[FC]	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS...............		2,685,000	3,285,000	3,560,000
[FC]					
[FC]					
[FC] [N]	CONSTRUCTION				
[FC]					
[FC]	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN......	3,257,000,000	109,875,000	109,875,000	109,875,000
[FC]	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR....................	33,800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
[FC]	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	1,310,000,000	20,300,000	20,300,000	20,300,000
[FC]	ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO............................	374,000,000	10,200,000	10,200,000	10,200,000
[FC]	TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA:	[465,500,000]	[2,000,000]	[2,000,000]	[2,000,000]
[FC]	RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA...........................	148,200,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
[FC]	WEST MEMPHIS, AR & VICINITY...........................	13,500,000	---	1,000,000	2,000,000
[FC]	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.................................	1,470,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
[FC]	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA................	150,000,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	11,700,000
[FC]	OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA.............................	---	---	---	400,000
[FC]	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA..........................	61,500,000	4,260,000	4,260,000	4,260,000
[FC]	HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBUTARIES [INCLUDING COW PEN CREEK	3,030,000	---	236,000	236,000
[FC]	SARDIS DAM, MS [DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE].................	29,300,000	555,000	555,000	555,000
[FC]	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	[1,463,229,000]	[29,225,000]	[29,225,000]	[29,225,000]
[FC]	BACKWATER FOWL MITIGATION LANDS..................	21,600,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
[FC]	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER..............................	115,000,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
[FC]	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL....................	80,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
[FC]	RESTUDY UNIT	12,000,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
[FC]	TRIBUTARIES	233,300,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
[FC]	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS	453,529,000	2,275,000	2,275,000	2,275,000
[FC]	MEMPHIS HARBOR [ENSLEY BERM] TN	23,100,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
[FC]	NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS	16,600,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
[FC]	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	120,000,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		226,215,000	227,451,000	228,851,000
	MAINTENANCE				
[FC]	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	62,887,000	62,887,000	62,887,000
[FC]	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR	---	679,000	679,000	679,000
[FC]	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR	---	151,000	151,000	151,000
[FC]	MISS RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, TN	---	6,922,000	6,922,000	6,922,000
[FC]	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO	---	7,998,000	9,593,000	7,998,000
[FC]	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF & TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	---	2,387,000	2,387,000	2,387,000
[FC]	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	521,000	521,000	521,000
[FC]	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	7,105,000	7,105,000	7,105,000
[FC]	BATON ROUGE HARBOR - DEVIL SWAMP, LA	---	170,000	170,000	170,000
[FC]	BAYOU COCODRIE & TRIBS, LA	---	155,000	155,000	155,000
[FC]	BONNET CARRE, LA	---	653,000	653,000	653,000
[FC]	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	63,000	63,000	63,000
[FC]	OLD RIVER, LA	---	6,715,000	6,715,000	6,715,000
[FC]	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	---	1,917,000	1,917,000	1,917,000
[N]	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	216,000	216,000	216,000
[N]	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	157,000	157,000	157,000
[FC]	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	[0]	[16,132,000]	[20,932,000]	[20,932,000]
[FC]	ARKABUTLA LAKE	---	2,359,000	3,109,000	3,109,000
[FC]	BACKWATER	---	424,000	424,000	424,000
[FC]	BIG SUNFLOWER	---	474,000	474,000	474,000
[FC]	ENID LAKE	---	2,845,000	4,095,000	4,095,000
[FC]	GREENWOOD	---	558,000	558,000	558,000
[FC]	GRENADA LAKE	---	3,579,000	4,829,000	4,829,000
[FC]	MAIN STEM	---	893,000	1,193,000	1,193,000
[FC]	SARDIS LAKE	---	3,212,000	4,462,000	4,462,000
[FC]	TRIBUTARIES	---	1,020,000	1,020,000	1,020,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
[FC]	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHANNEL....................	---	399,000	399,000	399,000
[FC]	YAZOO CITY....................................	---	369,000	369,000	369,000
[FC]	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO....................................	---	3,048,000	3,048,000	3,048,000
[N]	MEMPHIS HARBOR [MCKELLAR LAKE], TN....................	---	1,239,000	1,239,000	1,239,000
[FC]	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS.........................	---	1,082,000	1,082,000	1,082,000
[FC]	MAPPING..	---	803,000	803,000	803,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE..........................		121,000,000	127,395,000	125,800,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS, SLIPPAGE, AND PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED BALANCES....................	---	-15,400,000	-15,400,000	-19,218,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES.		334,500,000	342,731,000	338,993,000

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:

[FC]	FLOOD CONTROL
[FDP]	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
[N]	NAVIGATION

Army and the Corps of Engineers related to the rehabilitation of hydroelectric powerplants.

Because of improvements in technology, rehabilitation of generators and turbines often results in increases in the capacity of the powerplants. The Committee has been advised that the Corps is considering delaying needed rehabilitation until a sponsor is found who is willing to provide up-front financing for the rehabilitation. In exchange for funding the rehabilitation work, the sponsor would receive the rights to the additional power generated.

The Committee is opposed to these financing proposals and is convinced that they are not in the public interest and are inconsistent with the Federal responsibility for operation and maintenance of power facilities and marketing of power. In addition, these different financing arrangements could have a detrimental effect on the amount of funds deposited in the Treasury. Receipts from the sale of power from Corps projects totaling over $370,000,000 are deposited in the U.S. Treasury each year.

The Committee believes that the maintenance of a reliable power supply from its hydroelectric powerplants is a high-priority mission of the Corps and directs that the Corps not seek alternative financing methods for performing needed rehabilitation.

Equipment Replacement Study, Columbia River System.—The Committee is also concerned that many of the Columbia River hydroelectric system facilities are now 50 years old; that recent equipment failures have led to closures of locks and outages of dams; and that the Corps does not have in place a plan to systematically replace critical items. This failure to plan ahead has already increased the health and safety risk for workers; added unacceptable delays to receipt and installation of new equipment; and increased costs due to lost revenue from power generation.

The Committee, therefore, requests that the Corps prepare and transmit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate a report, including an implementation plan, which identifies the major equipment and systems of the Columbia River hydroelectric system, flood control and navigation facilities that are at or approaching the end of their useful life and will need replacement during the next decade.

Wetlands Research Program.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,000,000 for the Wetland Research Program. This is a new initiative for fiscal 1991 and the Committee strongly supports the program.

However, the Committee is concerned with the House Committee action earmarking funds for a specific demonstration project. The Committee feels strongly that this is a national program and should be managed and carried out with a national perspective. The central purpose of the Wetlands Research Program is to combine the environmental and engineering disciplines to provide the best technical, most cost-effective tools and methods to meet Corps and national needs. The information and techniques that will be developed in this program will be widely shared through coordination and cooperative efforts with other Federal and State agencies and a vigorous program of information dissemination and transfer.

Therefore, in order to get the best information and data, proposals should go through a vigorous review and evaluation process prior to selection. Earmarking of funds for specific demonstrations without adequate review, weakens the program, reduces the availability of quality data, and in the end results in greater costs to the Government. However, the Corps' attention is directed to a proposal to develop Putah Creek wetlands in the Yolo Bypass of the Yolo Basin Wildlife Area of California, and the Newport, OR, wetlands research and development project which would seek to demonstrate the benefits of using dredged material to reclaim previous wetlands.

Small Business Competitive Demonstration Program.—The Committee continues to support fully the objectives of the Small Business Competitive Demonstration Program for dredging. The Committee, however, is concerned about the consequences of applying small business set-aside procedures to Corps of Engineers' dredging contracts without recognizing equipment and other significant differences in capabilities of large and small dredgers. A study presented in testimony indicated that if the set-aside were applied without recognizing the fact that significant work cannot be performed by small dredging companies, the additional cost to accomplish the Nation's dredging will cost over $100,000,000 in the next 5 years and has already cost over $80,000,000 in the last 5 years.

In order to ensure the most efficient use of the limited funds available to the National Dredging Program of the civil works directorate of the Corps of Engineers and to avoid foregoing important dredging projects because of an unintended financial impact, the Secretary of the Army is directed to compute the annual monetary percentage goals included in the demonstration program for the small business concerns using the total annual funds awarded for the performance of the work actually performed with the type of plant available to the small business dredging firms. The total annual funds awarded for the performance of work by sea-going hopper dredges is not to be included in the computation, because the small business industry does not own or operate this type of equipment.

In addition, the attention of the Corps of Engineers is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance or review and for which the Committee has received requests—maintenance dredging of the Manatee Harbor channel; additional dredging at Wilmington Harbor, NC; dredging and repair of the notry jetty at Masonboro Inlet, NC; maintenance dredging needs at the Manitowoc Harbor, WI.

The following table is included for illustrative purposes only and shows the estimated work allowances for fiscal year 1989.

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	4,057,000	6,439,000
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	679,000	679,000
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	9,292,000	9,292,000
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	206,000	206,000
DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	429,000	429,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY [MOBILE DISTRICT], AL	2,766,000	2,766,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAK	4,233,000	4,233,000
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	13,401,000	13,401,000
PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	343,000	343,000
ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	3,352,000	3,352,000
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	13,675,000	13,675,000
WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	5,460,000	5,460,000
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,776,000	1,776,000
BETHEL SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	498,000	498,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,197,000	1,197,000
CORDOVA HARBOR, AK	405,000	405,000
DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	787,000	787,000
HOMER SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	413,000	413,000
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	253,000	253,000
NOME HARBOR, AK	490,000	490,000
ARIZONA		
ALAMO DAM, AZ	750,000	750,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	605,000	605,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	68,000	68,000
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	14,718,000	14,718,000
BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR	2,997,000	2,997,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	877,000	877,000
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,424,000	4,424,000
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,917,000	4,917,000
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	2,955,000	2,955,000
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	974,000	974,000
DIERKS LAKE, AR	824,000	824,000
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	851,000	851,000
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,202,000	4,202,000
HELENA HARBOR, AR	460,000	460,000
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	22,403,000	22,403,000
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	2,229,000	2,229,000
NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR	2,745,000	2,745,000
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,072,000	1,072,000
NORFORK LAKE, AR	4,082,000	4,082,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	575,000	575,000
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	4,831,000	4,831,000
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	3,522,000	3,522,000
WHITE RIVER, AR	2,243,000	2,243,000
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,394,000	1,394,000
BODEGA BAY, CA	795,000	795,000
BUCHANAN DAM - H.V. EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,274,000	1,274,000
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	3,421,000	3,421,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM - LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	1,663,000	1,663,000
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	130,000	130,000
DRY CREEK - WARM SPRINGS LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	2,431,000	2,431,000
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	221,000	221,000
HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,271,000	1,271,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	4,177,000	4,177,000
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	2,092,000	2,092,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	2,129,000	2,129,000
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	155,000	760,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
MARINA DEL REY, CA	1,700,000	1,700,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	187,000	187,000
MOJAVE RIVER RESERVOIR, CA	184,000	184,000
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	1,025,000	1,025,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,673,000	1,673,000
NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	751,000	751,000
NOYO RIVER & HARBOR, CA	613,000	613,000
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	2,091,000	2,091,000
OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS SYSTEM, CA	---	2,700,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	65,000	65,000
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	1,972,000	1,972,000
PORT HUENEME, CA	802,000	802,000
PORT SAN LUIS, CA	1,288,000	1,288,000
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	2,176,000	2,176,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER - SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	70,000	70,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES [DEBRIS CONTROL], CA.	721,000	721,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER [30 FOOT PROJECT], CA	2,115,000	2,115,000
SAN DIEGO RIVER - MISSION BAY, CA	877,000	877,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,323,000	2,323,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	---	2,000,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,530,000	1,530,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY [DRIFT REMOVAL], CA	1,808,000	1,808,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,385,000	1,385,000
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	2,566,000	2,566,000
SAN RAFAEL CREEK, CA	980,000	980,000
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	1,982,000	1,982,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	750,000	750,000
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,408,000	1,408,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	859,000	859,000
TERMINUS DAM - LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,216,000	1,216,000
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	1,270,000	1,270,000
YUBA RIVER, CA	25,000	25,000
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	333,000	333,000
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	650,000	650,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	441,000	441,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,021,000	2,021,000
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	701,000	701,000
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	266,000	266,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	232,000	232,000
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	255,000	255,000
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	634,000	634,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	333,000	333,000
NORTH COVE, CT	758,000	758,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	220,000	220,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	120,000	120,000
THOMASTON DAM, CT	425,000	425,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	470,000	470,000
DELAWARE		
CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL, ST. GEORGES BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	---	7,000,000
INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, DE	325,000	325,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CHINCOTEAGUE BAY TO DELAWARE BA	17,000	17,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE.	22,402,000	22,402,000
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	150,000	150,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,164,000	3,164,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS [DRIFT REMOVAL], DC	585,000	585,000
POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	500,000	500,000
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	21,000	21,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
FLORIDA		
APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	188,000	188,000
BLACKWATER RIVER, FL	8,000	8,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	2,315,000	2,315,000
CARRABELLE HARBOR, FL	277,000	277,000
CENTRAL & SOUTHERN, FL	4,627,000	4,627,000
CHANNELS, NAPLES TO BIG MARCO PASS, FL	907,000	907,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	1,123,000	1,123,000
CROSS FLORIDA BARGE CANAL, FL	2,072,000	2,072,000
EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	465,000	465,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	910,000	910,000
FORT MYERS BEACH, FL	925,000	925,000
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	651,000	651,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R. TO ANCLOTE R.	366,000	366,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	1,110,000	1,110,000
AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST. JOHNS RIVER	2,356,000	2,356,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	1,223,000	1,223,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	4,169,000	4,169,000
JOHNS PASS, FL	330,000	330,000
LA GRANGE BAYOU, FL	60,000	60,000
LONG BOAT PASS, FL	800,000	800,000
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	257,000	257,000
NEW PASS, FL	1,205,000	1,205,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	1,638,000	1,638,000
OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	28,000	28,000
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	944,000	944,000
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	31,000	31,000
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	107,000	107,000
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	114,000	114,000
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	67,000	67,000
PORT ST. JOE HARBOR, FL	637,000	637,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,196,000	3,196,000
ST. AUGUSTINE HARBOR, FL	827,000	827,000
ST. LUCIE INLET, FL	130,000	130,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	2,196,000	2,196,000
GEORGIA		
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	3,766,000	3,766,000
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,872,000	4,872,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY [SAVANNAH DISTRICT], GA	947,000	947,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,533,000	7,533,000
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	5,707,000	5,707,000
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	3,278,000	3,278,000
J. STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	7,671,000	7,671,000
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	5,422,000	5,422,000
RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	3,925,000	3,925,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	5,173,000	5,173,000
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	245,000	245,000
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	4,908,000	4,908,000
HAWAII		
BARBER'S POINT HARBOR, HI	55,000	55,000
KAUNAKAKAI HARBOR, HAWAII	65,000	65,000
PORT ALLEN HARBOR, KAUAI	65,000	65,000
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	2,939,000	2,939,000
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	6,105,000	6,105,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	683,000	683,000
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL	157,000	157,000
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	3,365,000	3,365,000
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	1,133,000	1,133,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	1,923,000	1,923,000
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	255,000	255,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL [LMVD PORTION]	1,647,000	1,647,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL AND IN	14,355,000	14,355,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,343,000	1,343,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	4,157,000	4,157,000
MISS RIVER BTWN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN	40,518,000	40,518,000
MISS RVR BTWN MO RIVER & MINNEAPOLIS, IL & MN [LMVD PO	9,935,000	9,935,000
REND LAKE, IL	3,426,000	3,426,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	908,000	908,000
INDIANA		
BEVERLY SHORES, IN	21,000	21,000
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	534,000	534,000
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	143,000	143,000
BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	340,000	340,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	604,000	604,000
CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE, IN	644,000	644,000
HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	505,000	505,000
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	597,000	597,000
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	52,000	52,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	450,000	450,000
MONROE LAKE, IN	929,000	929,000
PATOKA LAKE, IN	478,000	478,000
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	466,000	466,000
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,637,000	2,637,000
FORT MADISON HARBOR, IA	68,000	68,000
MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	52,000	52,000
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	6,380,000	6,380,000
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	1,480,000	1,480,000
RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,342,000	3,342,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,237,000	3,237,000
SMALL NAV PROJ AT SIOUX CITY, IOWA - SECTION 107, IA	5,000	5,000
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,364,000	1,364,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,002,000	1,002,000
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	450,000	450,000
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	723,000	723,000
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	976,000	976,000
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	961,000	961,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,100,000	1,100,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,504,000	1,504,000
MARION LAKE, KS	740,000	740,000
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,375,000	1,375,000
MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,039,000	2,039,000
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	755,000	755,000
PERRY LAKE, KS	1,503,000	1,503,000
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,251,000	1,251,000
TORONTO LAKE, KS	388,000	388,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	1,360,000	1,360,000
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,171,000	1,171,000
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY	4,786,000	4,786,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,098,000	1,098,000
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,030,000	1,030,000
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	718,000	718,000
CARR FORK LAKE, KY	846,000	846,000
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	535,000	535,000
DEWEY LAKE, KY	927,000	927,000
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,028,000	1,028,000
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	717,000	717,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,161,000	1,161,000
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,251,000	1,251,000
HICKMAN HARBOR, KY	513,000	513,000
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,343,000	1,343,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	981,000	981,000
LICKING RIVER, KY	13,000	13,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	573,000	573,000
MIDDLESBORO, KY	37,000	37,000
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,298,000	1,298,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	36,435,000	37,435,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV.	4,849,000	4,849,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	723,000	723,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,599,000	1,599,000
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	674,000	674,000
WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	4,809,000	4,809,000
YATESVILLE LAKE KY	661,000	661,000
LOUISANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	3,607,000	3,737,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	1,900,000	1,900,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	368,000	368,000
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	38,000	38,000
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	188,000	188,000
BAYOU TECHE, LA	1,005,000	1,005,000
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	275,000	275,000
CADDO LAKE, LA	97,000	97,000
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	3,475,000	3,665,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	2,535,000	2,535,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	10,890,000	10,890,000
HOUMA NAVIGATION CHANNEL, LA	165,000	645,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	258,000	258,000
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	68,000	68,000
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,320,000	1,320,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA.	52,000,000	58,222,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	7,280,000	7,280,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	2,040,000	2,040,000
PEARL RIVER, MS	1,049,000	1,646,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT,.	3,567,000	3,567,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,525,000	1,525,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	156,000	156,000
WATERWAY - EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	232,000	232,000
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD & VA	9,233,000	9,233,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR [PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS],	375,000	375,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR [DRIFT REMOVAL], MD	294,000	294,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	79,000	79,000
FISHING CREEK, MD	350,000	350,000
HERRING CREEK, TALL TIMBERS, MD	30,000	30,000
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,203,000	1,203,000
NEALE SOUND, MD	517,000	517,000
OCEAN CITY HARBOR & INLET & SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	450,000	450,000
ST. JEROME CREEK, MD	372,000	372,000
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	1,000,000	1,000,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	431,000	431,000
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	444,000	444,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	291,000	291,000
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	6,387,000	6,387,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREAS, MA	154,000	154,000
CHATHAM [STAGE] HARBOR, MA	907,000	907,000
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	170,000	170,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	285,000	285,000
GREEN HARBOR, MA	335,000	335,000
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	326,000	326,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	541,000	541,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	460,000	460,000
NEW BEDFORD, FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	327,000	327,000
NEWBURYPORT HARBOR, MA	461,000	461,000
TULLY LAKE, MA	439,000	439,000
WEST HILL DAM, MA	386,000	386,000
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	302,000	302,000
MICHIGAN		
ALPENA HARBOR, MI	238,000	238,000
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	78,000	78,000
AU SABLE HARBOR, MI	266,000	266,000
BIG BAY HARBOR, MI	135,000	135,000
BOLLES HARBOR, MI	253,000	253,000
CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI	168,000	168,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR, MI	391,000	391,000
CHANNELS IN STRAITS OF MACKINAC, MI	213,000	213,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	24,000	24,000
CHEBOYGAN HARBOR, MI	166,000	166,000
CLINTON RIVER, MI	68,000	68,000
DETROIT RIVER, MI	2,963,000	2,963,000
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	158,000	158,000
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	870,000	870,000
GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	121,000	121,000
GRAYS REEF PASSAGE, MI	44,000	44,000
HARBOR BEACH HARBOR,MI	781,000	781,000
HARRISVILLE HARBOR, MI	151,000	151,000
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	510,000	510,000
INLAND ROUTE, MI	19,000	19,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	664,000	664,000
LELAND HARBOR, MI	117,000	117,000
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	111,000	111,000
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	120,000	120,000
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	510,000	510,000
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	214,000	214,000
MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	709,000	709,000
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	236,000	236,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	23,000	23,000
MONROE HARBOR, MI	188,000	188,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	277,000	277,000
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	2,850,000	2,850,000
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	151,000	151,000
PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	210,000	210,000
PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	369,000	369,000
ROUGE RIVER, MI	724,000	724,000
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	4,050,000	4,050,000
SEBEWAING RIVER [ICE JAM REMOVAL], MI	15,000	15,000
ST. CLAIR RIVER, MI	910,000	910,000
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	711,000	711,000
ST. MARYS RIVER, MI	12,717,000	12,717,000
WHITEFISH POINT HARBOR, MI	94,000	94,000
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE, WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	160,000	160,000
DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	4,027,000	4,027,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	312,000	312,000
LAKE TRAVERSE AND BOIS DE SIOUX, SD & MN	219,000	219,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI AND MINNEAPOLIS, MN	36,245,000	36,245,000
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	272,000	272,000
ORWELL LAKE, MN	324,000	324,000
RED LAKE RIVER, MN	85,000	85,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	1,745,000	1,745,000
ST. PAUL SMALL BOAT HARBOR, MN	15,000	15,000
TWO HARBORS, MN	2,635,000	2,635,000
WINONA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, MN	15,000	15,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS......................................	726,000	726,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS..............................	149,000	149,000
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS.........................	249,000	249,000
GRENADA LAKE, MS.......................................	100,000	100,000
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS....................................	2,302,000	2,302,000
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS...............................	164,000	164,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS.....................................	1,371,000	1,371,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS..................................	4,398,000	4,398,000
PASS CHRISTIAN HARBOR, MS..............................	323,000	323,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS....................................	379,000	379,000
WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS, MS.............................	181,000	181,000
YAZOO RIVER, MS..	275,000	275,000
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO..............................	380,000	380,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO...........	5,469,000	5,469,000
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO....................................	1,950,000	1,950,000
HANNIBAL HARBOR, MO....................................	68,000	68,000
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO...................	8,031,000	8,031,000
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO............................	840,000	840,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO...................................	555,000	555,000
MISS. RVR BETWN OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS, IL & MO.....	10,971,000	10,971,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO................................	1,402,000	1,402,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO....................................	1,047,000	1,047,000
STOCKTON LAKE, MO......................................	2,930,000	2,930,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO....................................	4,749,000	4,749,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO....................................	147,000	147,000
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT...............................	3,566,000	4,566,000
LIBBY DAM, MT..	3,898,000	3,898,000
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS & CLARK LAKE, NE & SD.........	5,144,000	5,144,000
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE.................................	1,296,000	1,296,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATION RIVER, NE & SD...........	---	200,000
PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE...............	640,000	640,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE.........................	660,000	660,000
NEVADA		
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA.............................	381,000	381,000
PINE-MATHEWS CANYONS DAMS, NV..........................	87,000	87,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH.....................................	400,000	400,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH..............................	355,000	355,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH.................................	591,000	591,000
HAMPTON HARBOR, NH.....................................	288,000	288,000
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH............................	1,009,000	1,009,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH...................................	370,000	370,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH................................	558,000	558,000
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....................................	850,000	850,000
CHEESEQUAKE CREEK, NJ..................................	50,000	50,000
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ..................................	385,000	385,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ.......	3,280,000	3,280,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE..	11,410,000	11,410,000
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ....................................	190,000	190,000
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ...................	2,529,000	2,529,000
NEWARK BAY HACKENSACK & PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ............	50,000	50,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	600,000	600,000
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	1,050,000	1,050,000
SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	30,000	30,000
SANDY HOOK BAY AT LEONARDO, NJ	880,000	880,000
SHARK RIVER, NJ	40,000	40,000
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,233,000	1,233,000
COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,494,000	1,494,000
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	869,000	869,000
GALISTEO DAM, NM	216,000	216,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	400,000	400,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	705,000	705,000
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	423,000	423,000
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	278,000	278,000
ARKPORT DAM, NY	167,000	167,000
BAYRIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	1,417,000	1,417,000
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	3,122,000	3,122,000
BRONX RIVER, NY	720,000	720,000
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,507,000	1,507,000
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	75,000	75,000
CATTARAUGUS CREEK HARBOR, NY	250,000	250,000
CONEY ISLAND CHANNEL, NY	720,000	720,000
CONEY ISLAND CREEK, NY	40,000	40,000
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	225,000	225,000
EAST CHESTER CREEK, NY	150,000	150,000
EAST RIVER, NY	1,410,000	1,410,000
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	630,000	630,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	294,000	294,000
ECHO BAY HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET, NY	835,000	835,000
FLUSHING BAY & CREEK, NY	690,000	690,000
GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, NY	140,000	140,000
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	50,000	50,000
HARLEM RIVER, NY	140,000	140,000
HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,102,000	2,102,000
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	660,000	660,000
JAMAICA BAY, NY	850,000	850,000
JONES INLET NY	40,000	40,000
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	30,000	30,000
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	60,000	60,000
MAMARONECK HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,284,000	1,284,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, NY & VT	40,000	40,000
NEW ROCHELLE HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	2,705,000	2,705,000
NEW YORK HARBOR [DRIFT REMOVAL], NY	3,290,000	3,290,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	4,279,000	4,279,000
NEW YORK HARBOR [PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS]	605,000	605,000
NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	30,000	30,000
NORTHPORT HARBOR, NY	50,000	50,000
OAK ORCHARD HBR, NY	150,000	150,000
OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	145,000	145,000
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	405,000	405,000
PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	30,000	30,000
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	801,000	801,000
SHEEPSHEAD BAY, NY	40,000	40,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK PROJECTS, NY	2,106,000	2,106,000
TARRYTOWN HARBOR, NY	50,000	50,000
WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	550,000	550,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	1,077,000	1,077,000
WILSON HARBOR, NY	230,000	230,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY [WILMINGTON DISTRICT],.	5,437,000	5,437,000
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,039,000	1,039,000
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	416,000	416,000
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	675,000	675,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	481,000	481,000
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	579,000	579,000
CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT, NC	393,000	393,000
FALLS LAKE, NC	1,048,000	1,048,000
FAR CREEK, NC	946,000	946,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	535,000	535,000
MANTEO [SHALLOWBAG] BAY, NC	5,117,000	5,117,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	1,983,000	1,983,000
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	538,000	538,000
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	520,000	520,000
OCRACOKE INLET, NC	278,000	278,000
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	395,000	395,000
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	786,000	786,000
WATERWAY CONNECTING PAMLICO SOUND AND BEAUFORT HARBOR,	245,000	245,000
W. KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,537,000	1,537,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	4,612,000	4,612,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN HALEY LAKE, ND	222,000	222,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	6,390,000	6,390,000
HOMME LAKE AND DAM, ND	100,000	100,000
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	640,000	640,000
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	336,000	336,000
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	519,000	519,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	267,000	267,000
BERLIN LAKE, OH	2,336,000	2,336,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	739,000	739,000
CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM, OH	479,000	479,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	3,362,000	3,362,000
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	220,000	220,000
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	373,000	373,000
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	777,000	777,000
DILLON LAKE, OH	434,000	434,000
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	37,000	37,000
HURON HARBOR, OH	37,000	37,000
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	1,149,000	1,149,000
MASSILLON, OH	20,000	20,000
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	736,000	736,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	794,000	794,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	5,384,000	5,384,000
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	177,000	177,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	471,000	471,000
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	75,000	75,000
ROCKY RIVER, OH	250,000	250,000
ROSEVILLE, OH	20,000	20,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	320,000	320,000
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	7,862,000	7,862,000
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	326,000	326,000
VERMILION HARBOR, OH	275,000	275,000
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	371,000	371,000
WEST HARBOR, OH	75,000	75,000
WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE, OH	586,000	586,000
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	390,000	390,000
CANDY LAKE, OK	30,000	30,000
BIRCH LAKE, OK	771,000	771,000
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,641,000	1,641,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,409,000	1,409,000
COPAN LAKE, OK	919,000	919,000
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	3,647,000	3,647,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	3,018,000	3,018,000
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	792,000	792,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	499,000	499,000
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	589,000	589,000
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,281,000	1,281,000
HULAH LAKE, OK	770,000	770,000
KAW LAKE, OK	1,790,000	1,790,000
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	2,188,000	2,188,000
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,206,000	1,206,000
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	556,000	556,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	10,000	10,000
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	876,000	876,000
ROBERT S. KERR L&D AND RESERVOIRS, OK	3,149,000	3,149,000
SARDIS LAKE, OK	856,000	856,000
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,727,000	1,727,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	2,854,000	2,854,000
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,240,000	1,240,000
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	2,865,000	2,865,000
WISTER LAKE, OK	6,305,000	6,305,000
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	431,000	431,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	159,000	159,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM-LAKE BONNEVILLE, OR	11,645,000	11,645,000
CHETCO RIVER, OR	6,000	6,000
COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R. BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTL	10,883,000	10,883,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT MOUTH, OR & WA	8,571,000	8,571,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA & THE DALLES, OR.	378,000	378,000
COOS & MILLICOMA RIVERS, OR	172,000	172,000
COOS BAY, OR	4,166,000	4,166,000
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	274,000	274,000
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	630,000	630,000
COUGAR LAKE, OR	943,000	943,000
DETROIT LAKE, OR	1,698,000	1,698,000
DORENA LAKE, OR	497,000	497,000
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	357,000	357,000
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	592,000	592,000
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,004,000	2,004,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	562,000	562,000
JOHN DAY LOCK & DAM - LAKE UMATILLA, OR	12,535,000	12,535,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	2,708,000	2,708,000
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,085,000	3,085,000
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR	10,845,000	10,845,000
PORT ORFORD, OR	105,000	105,000
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	532,000	532,000
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	727,000	727,000
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	216,000	216,000
TILLAMOOK BAY & BAR, OR	6,000	3,756,000
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,260,000	1,260,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR	104,000	104,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	709,000	709,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	437,000	437,000
YAQUINA BAY & HARBOR, OR	1,151,000	1,151,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,075,000	6,075,000
ALVIN R. BUSH DAM, PA	402,000	402,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	152,000	152,000
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	731,000	731,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	1,367,000	1,367,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,140,000	1,140,000
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,135,000	1,135,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,390,000	1,390,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	410,000	410,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
ERIE HARBOR, PA......................................	87,000	87,000
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA....................	777,000	777,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA..........................	508,000	508,000
FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM, PA.............................	445,000	445,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM & RESERVOIR, PA..............	255,000	255,000
JOHNSTOWN, PA...	6,000	6,000
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA................	1,464,000	1,464,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA...................................	1,038,000	1,038,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA...............................	680,000	680,000
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.................................	11,675,000	11,675,000
PROMPTON LAKE, PA.....................................	379,000	379,000
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA......................................	5,000	5,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA.....................................	1,978,000	1,978,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA..................................	1,400,000	1,400,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA...............................	2,017,000	2,017,000
STILLWATER LAKE, PA...................................	235,000	235,000
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA...............................	1,278,000	1,278,000
TIONESTA LAKE, PA.....................................	1,103,000	1,103,000
UNION CITY LAKE, PA...................................	308,000	308,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA...............................	803,000	803,000
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA..............................	1,938,000	1,938,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA...........................	2,036,000	2,036,000
PUERTO RICO		
ARECIBO HARBOR, PR....................................	650,000	650,000
MAYAQUEZ HARBOR, PR...................................	200,000	200,000
PONCE HARBOR, PR......................................	165,000	165,000
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR...................................	1,000,000	1,000,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (CHARLESTON DISTRICT),.	2,282,000	2,282,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.................................	2,750,000	2,750,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC...................	3,246,000	3,246,000
FOLLY RIVER, SC.......................................	535,000	535,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC.................................	1,859,000	1,859,000
JEREMY CREEK, SC......................................	1,000	1,000
LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC...........................	144,000	144,000
MURRELLS INLET, CS....................................	146,000	146,000
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC.................................	894,000	894,000
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC....................................	608,000	608,000
TOWN CREEK, SC..	444,000	444,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD........................	6,651,000	6,651,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD...................................	274,000	274,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD...........................	147,000	147,000
FT. RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD...............	7,334,000	7,334,000
OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND.........................	8,006,000	8,006,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN..................................	3,619,000	3,619,000
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN.............................	5,507,000	5,507,000
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN....................	3,159,000	3,159,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN..................................	3,206,000	3,206,000
J. PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN.................	3,031,000	3,031,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN..........................	5,258,000	5,258,000
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN...................................	11,049,000	11,049,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN.................................	675,000	675,000
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX......................................	505,000	505,000
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VIII, TX...	651,000	651,000
BARDWELL LAKE, TX.....................................	876,000	876,000
BELTON LAKE, TX.......................................	1,731,000	1,731,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,254,000	1,254,000
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	3,025,000	3,025,000
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,497,000	1,497,000
CANYON LAKE, TX	1,008,000	1,008,000
CHANNEL TO HARLINGEN, TX	720,000	720,000
CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	600,000	600,000
CHANNEL TO VICTORIA - GIWW, TX	1,725,000	1,725,000
COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	137,000	137,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,037,000	5,037,000
DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX	4,314,000	4,314,000
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	8,000	8,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	1,510,000	1,510,000
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	2,835,000	2,835,000
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	41,000	41,000
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,040,000	1,040,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,605,000	1,605,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	13,185,000	13,185,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	655,000	655,000
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,697,000	6,697,000
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	519,000	519,000
LAKE KEMP, TX	178,000	178,000
LAVON LAKE, TX	1,970,000	1,970,000
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	1,903,000	1,903,000
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,734,000	1,734,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,052,000	1,052,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,026,000	1,026,000
O. C. FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	777,000	777,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,081,000	1,081,000
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	892,000	892,000
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	535,000	535,000
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	6,282,000	6,282,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	2,649,000	2,649,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,236,000	2,236,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,396,000	1,396,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM-STEINHAGEN LAKE-WILLIS HYDROPOWER, TX	1,167,000	1,167,000
TRINITY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, TX	20,000	20,000
WACO LAKE, TX	1,573,000	1,573,000
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	402,000	402,000
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	2,772,000	2,772,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,734,000	1,734,000
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	394,000	394,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	366,000	366,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	357,000	357,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	347,000	347,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	330,000	330,000
VIRGINIA		
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VIRGINIA	1,000,000	1,000,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	4,642,000	4,642,000
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	695,000	695,000
CHINCOTEAGUE BAY CHANNEL, VA	246,000	246,000
CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	129,000	129,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	734,000	734,000
CRANES CREEK, VA	181,000	181,000
DEEP CREEK, VA	715,000	715,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,341,000	1,341,000
GREENVALE CREEK, LANCASTER COUNTY, VA	229,000	229,000
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR[DRIFT REMOVA	216,000	216,000
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	780,000	780,000
JOHN H. KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC	5,691,000	5,691,000
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,024,000	1,024,000
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	719,000	719,000
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA	4,160,000	4,160,000
NORFOLK HARBOR [PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS], V	520,000	520,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA....................	299,000	299,000
OYSTER CHANNEL, VA....................................	328,000	328,000
PARKER CREEK, VA......................................	274,000	274,000
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA.....................................	1,662,000	1,662,000
QUEENS CREEK, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA......................	260,000	260,000
QUINBY CREEK, VA......................................	366,000	366,000
STARLINGS CREEK, VA...................................	360,000	360,000
TANGIER CHANNEL, VA...................................	427,000	427,000
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA.............................	1,405,000	1,405,000
TYLERS BEACH, VA......................................	201,000	201,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA.................	1,054,000	1,054,000
WINTER HARBOR, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA.....................	385,000	385,000
WASHINGTON		
ANACORTES HARBOR, WA..................................	12,000	12,000
BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA.................................	815,000	815,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, RUFUS WOODS LAKE, WA................	9,488,000	9,488,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR..................	347,000	347,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK & SAND ISLAND, WA......	330,000	330,000
ELOCHOMAN SLOUGH, WA..................................	106,000	106,000
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA................	1,027,000	1,027,000
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA...................	2,493,000	2,493,000
HOWARD A HANSON DAM, WA...............................	750,000	750,000
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA...........................	5,682,000	5,682,000
KENMORE NAVIGATION CHANNEL, WA........................	7,000	7,000
LAKE CROCKETT [KEYSTONE HARBOR], WA...................	26,000	26,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA........................	6,702,000	6,702,000
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA.........................	3,553,000	3,553,000
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA........................	5,169,000	5,169,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA.....................	4,306,000	4,306,000
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA...................................	528,000	528,000
MT. ST. HELEN SEDIMENT CONTROL STRUCTURE, WA..........	566,000	566,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA..................................	5,710,000	5,710,000
OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA....................................	20,000	20,000
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA..................	707,000	707,000
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA..................................	487,000	487,000
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA....................................	397,000	397,000
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA...............................	91,000	91,000
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA.................................	29,000	29,000
TACOMA - PUYALLUP, WA.................................	31,000	31,000
TACOMA HARBOR, WA.....................................	62,000	62,000
THE DALLES LOCK & DAM - LAKE CELILO, WA...............	6,719,000	6,719,000
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA..........................	185,000	185,000
WYNOOCHEE LAKE, WA....................................	250,000	250,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV...................................	689,000	689,000
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV....................................	982,000	982,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV...................................	1,015,000	1,015,000
CHARLESTON RIVERFRONT PARK............................	---	350,000
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV....................................	1,059,000	1,059,000
ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV..................................	300,000	300,000
ELKINS, WV..	5,000	5,000
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV......................	6,590,000	6,590,000
R. D. BAILEY LAKE, WV.................................	1,337,000	1,337,000
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV............................	872,000	872,000
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV.................................	1,151,000	1,151,000
SUTTON LAKE, WV.......................................	1,325,000	1,325,000
TYGART LAKE, WV.......................................	915,000	915,000
WISCONSIN		
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI....................................	542,000	542,000
CORNUCOPIA HARBOR, WI.................................	124,000	124,000
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE WISCONSIN, WI....................	485,000	485,000
FOX RIVER, WI...	1,187,000	1,187,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI..................................	1,259,000	1,259,000

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI - DIKE DISPOSAL..................	807,000	807,000
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI....................................	138,000	138,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI...................................	317,000	317,000
LA FARGE LAKE, WI.....................................	32,000	32,000
LA POINTE HARBOR, WI..................................	92,000	92,000
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI..................................	360,000	360,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI..................................	2,395,000	2,395,000
OCONTO HARBOR, WI.....................................	363,000	363,000
PEPIN SMALL BOAT HARBOR, WI...........................	8,000	8,000
PORT WING HARBOR, WI..................................	135,000	135,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI..................................	486,000	486,000
STURGEON BAY, WI......................................	699,000	699,000
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE, SNAKE RIVER, WY.........................	787,000	787,000
MISCELLANEOUS		
DREDGING RESEARCH PROGRAM.............................	7,200,000	7,200,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS.........................	6,671,000	6,671,000
MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS..............	1,850,000	1,850,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM [NEPP]........	8,000,000	8,000,000
POLICY AND PROCEDURES OPTIONS FOR PROJECT O&M.........	1,000,000	---
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS.............................	9,904,000	9,904,000
PROTECTION, CLEARING, AND STRAIGHTENING OF CHANNELS [S	50,000	50,000
RECREATION PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE.....................	800,000	800,000
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS.............................	1,000,000	1,000,000
REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REHABILITATION RE	4,000,000	4,000,000
SCHEDULING OF FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS......	2,622,000	2,922,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS..............	2,835,000	2,835,000
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS........................	3,695,000	3,695,000
WETLANDS RESEARCH PROGRAM.............................	3,000,000	3,000,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS & SLIPPAGE..........	-18,646,000	-31,261,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE................	1,389,500,000	1,408,791,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

[MP]	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
[FC]	FLOOD CONTROL
[BE]	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
[N]	NAVIGATION

GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS

Appropriations, 1990	$68,455,000
Budget estimate, 1991	75,100,000
House allowance	71,100,000
Committee recommendation	71,100,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $71,100,000 for fiscal year 1991 for general regulatory functions. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers general regulatory functions were formerly financed as part of the "Operation and maintenance, General appropriation" account. The appropriation recommended provides salaries, expenses, and related costs to administer laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands of the United States in accordance with the River and Harbors Act of 1899, the Clean Water Act of 1977, and the Marine Protection Act of 1972.

The Committee is concerned about the significant backlog of permit applications in the Corps' regulatory program. The Committee recognizes that the Corps' workload on regulatory matters has increased significantly and that there is a shortage of regulatory staff in many Corps districts. The Committee is also concerned that staffing problems, caseload backlog, and unreasonable delays in response time, are undermining the effort to protect wetlands and seriously threaten the effectiveness of the section 404 program.

The Committee believes that additional staff should be assigned to the Corps' regulatory programs to reduce delays in the permit processing. The Committee has directed the Corps' attention to the problems in previous years and the need to thoroughly review district regulatory staffing in order to better match manpower requirements with those districts experiencing significant increases in permit applications. The Committee, therefore, strongly urges that the Corps increase staffing levels in areas where critical backlogs in the regulatory permit programs exit.

REVOLVING FUND

The Committee has been informed that the Corps has initiated a restudy of its minimum dredge fleet requirements for national defense and national emergency under Public Law 95-269. The Corps expects that the new study will be completed by May 1991. Pending completion of this study, the Corps has agreed with the private industry to defer all proposed plans for replacement of dredges other than the new dredge *Hurley*. In determining the size and composition of the minimum dredge fleet, the Corps of Engineers should consult with private industry to encourage maximum private investment in new dredging capability. The Committee urges that the Corps reexamine its current operational schedule for hopper dredges to determine if the schedule is reasonably necessary to keep its hopper dredge fleet fully operational.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1990	$141,997,000
Budget estimate, 1991	136,100,000
House allowance	136,100,000
Committee recommendation	136,100,000

An amount of $136,100,000 is recommended for general expenses of the Corps of Engineers, which is the same as the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division offices, the Board for Rivers and Harbors, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers is studying the question of A–76 as it relates to operation and maintenance of flood control and navigation projects, and hydropower facilities. The Corps study will address the applicability of the A–76 process in these functions and whether savings continue over the long run; alternatives to A–76 for achieving management efficiencies; validity of current and proposed exclusions, exceptions and exemptions; the private sector perspective; and the experiences of other agencies. The Corps should provide the results of this study to Congress prior to resuming A–76 studies in these operation and maintenance functions.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1990	$11,369,000
Budget estimate, 1991	11,456,000
House allowance	12,926,000
Committee recommendation	12,521,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $12,521,000 which is $405,000 over the House allowance.

Tongue River Dam, MT.—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to study and prepare a special report, in sufficient detail to support the decision-making process, of spillway alternatives and reserved water right issues related to the Tongue River Dam in Montana. The Committee understands that the Federal funds will be matched with funds and/or in-kind services by non-Federal interest on a 50-50 basis.

Southeastern South Dakota pipeline.—The committee has provided $100,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to assist the State of South Dakota in the development of a needs assessment, and relevant planning studies related to the Southeastern South Dakota water supply pipeline project.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and activities are shown in the following table:

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1990	$652,850,000
Budget estimate, 1991	609,430,000
House allowance	649,697,000
Committee recommendation	641,027,000

A new appropriation of $641,027,000 is recommended by the Committee.

The amounts recommended by the Committee are shown on the following table along with the budget request and House allowance.

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1990	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS					
ARIZONA					
UPPER SAN PEDRO RIVER OPTIMIZATION STUDY..............	450,000	---	75,000	75,000	75,000
CALIFORNIA					
AMERICAN RIVER FOLSOM SOUTH OPTIMIZATION STUDY........	250,000	---	50,000	50,000	50,000
DELTA WATER MANAGEMENT................................	---	---	---	350,000	100,000
INDIAN WELLS VALLEY WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY............	525,000	227,987	175,000	175,000	175,000
OFFSTREAM STORAGE INVESTIGATION.......................	---	---	---	150,000	150,000
REFUGE WATER SUPPLY...................................	---	---	---	200,000	---
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.........	---	---	---	180,000	180,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE	1,800,000	---	200,000	200,000	200,000
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONVEYANCE.........................	---	---	---	50,000	50,000
SANTA ANA WATERSHED MANAGEMENT STUDY..................	500,000	401,000	99,000	99,000	99,000
SMALL PROJECT INTEGRATION WITH CVP....................	190,000	---	60,000	---	---
COLORADO					
SOUTH PLATTE RIVER OPERATIONS STUDY...................	---	---	---	75,000	---
UPPER GUNNISON-UNCOMPAHGRE BASIN PROJECT..............	920,000	293,616	280,000	280,000	280,000
IDAHO					
IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT........................	525,000	---	75,000	75,000	75,000
MINIDOKA, NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIV. DRAINWTR MGMT STDY..	350,000	---	80,000	80,000	80,000
KANSAS					
ARKANSAS RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT STUDY.....	990,000	516,575	240,000	240,000	240,000
MONTANA					
FLATHEAD RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION STUDY.......	495,000	59,000	215,000	215,000	215,000
TONGUE RIVER DAM, MT..................................	300,000	---	---	---	300,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1990	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
NEBRASKA					
LOUP RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGMENT STUDY................	---	---	---	---	75,000
PRAIRIE BEND UNIT, P-SMBP............................	---	---	---	200,000	200,000
NEVADA					
NORTHERN NEVADA WATER AUGMENTATION PROGRAM...........	500,000	262,000	180,000	180,000	180,000
NEW MEXICO					
NEW MEXICO REGIONAL WATER RESOURCES STUDY............	600,000	---	200,000	200,000	200,000
OKLAHOMA					
NORTHWEST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY................	---	---	---	150,000	150,000
OREGON					
GRAND RONDE BASIN WATER OPT. STUDY...................	---	---	---	75,000	220,000
JOSEPHINE COUNTY WATER MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT STUDY...	670,000	410,523	200,000	200,000	200,000
NORTHERN DOUGLAS CO. COOP. WATER RESOURCES STUDY......	1,179,209	1,129,209	50,000	50,000	50,000
UPPER DESCHUTES RIVER BASIN WATER CONSERVATION PROJECT	745,000	79,000	290,000	290,000	290,000
UPPER JOHN DAY WATER OPTIMIZATION PROJECT............	710,584	407,584	250,000	250,000	250,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.......	591,603	328,603	180,000	180,000	180,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
BLACK HILLS HYDROLOGY STUDY..........................	---	---	---	100,000	100,000
SOUTHEASTERN SOUTH DAKOTA PIPELINE...................	---	---	---	---	100,000
TEXAS					
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN TOTAL WATER MGMT STUDY.....	650,000	216,630	200,000	200,000	200,000
UTAH					
SEVIER RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY..................	463,508	217,508	120,000	120,000	120,000
UTAH AREA WATER DEMAND MODEL.........................	275,000	49,000	100,000	100,000	100,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1990	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
WASHINGTON					
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT..........	7,944,758	6,954,758	540,000	540,000	540,000
WYOMING					
WIND RIVER BASIN STUDY................................	425,000	---	37,000	37,000	37,000
VARIOUS					
COLORADO RIVER RECHARGE STUDY..........................	280,000	223,154	30,000	30,000	30,000
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM......	43,726,650	37,710,439	935,000	935,000	935,000
DROUGHT INVESTIGATIONS................................	1,640,000	---	220,000	220,000	220,000
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES...	5,832,378	3,133,378	2,699,000	2,699,000	2,699,000
FOUR CORNERS WATER ASSESSMENT.........................	440,000	77,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES..............................	9,250,506	2,790,506	875,000	875,000	875,000
INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS....................	1,023,187	633,187	390,000	390,000	390,000
MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS................	993,620	472,620	521,000	521,000	521,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES........................	2,943,000	1,593,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
TOXIC CONSTITUENT STUDIES.............................	1,164,000	99,000	265,000	265,000	265,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION..........	723,984	427,726	125,000	125,000	125,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE........	---	---	---	---	-500,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.........................			11,456,000	12,926,000	12,521,000

Animas-La Plata project, Colorado and New Mexico.—The Committee is aware of the recent draft biological opinion issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service related to the Animas-La Plata project. The Committee also understands that the Bureau of Reclamation and other interested parties are currently working to evaluate alternatives and formulate a response to the draft opinion. The Endangered Species Act provides a process to address the sensitive issues and adverse impacts. In recommending the full budget request, it is not the intent of the Committee to prejudge the outcome of activities currently underway or project construction. The Committee expects to be kept informed on actions taken to address the draft biological opinion and other complex issues surrounding the Animas-La Plata project.

Velarde community ditch project, NM.—Within available funds, the Bureau shall make $500,000 available to continue work on the Velarde community ditch project in New Mexico.

Garrison Diversion Unit, North Dakota.—The Committee recommendation includes $35,000,000 to continue construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit of the Missouri River basin plan in North Dakota.

The Committee views the administration's request of no funding for the project as another in a string of broken promises made to the people of North Dakota. In 1986, the President signed the Garrison Diversion Reformulation Act which downsized the project and provided for environmental mitigation and enhancement features unmatched by other Federal water projects. The Committee plans to continue moving the authorized Garrison project forward and encourages the administration to reconsider its current position with regard to future funding requests.

The Bureau is directed to utilize $250,000 to conduct investigations, layouts, and estimates for alternative irrigation service areas at Turtle Lake, adjacent to the McClusky Canal, as authorized under the act. In addition, $550,000 is provided to enable the Bureau to complete phase II of the ground water recharge wells at the Oakes test area, and finalize plans, from the options available, for the provisions of water to the Oakes area.

The Committee is aware of the urgent need to address the declining water level and the resulting water quality of Devils Lake. At risk is one of the Midwest's most productive fisheries. Since the inception of the Garrison project, use of Missouri River water to stabilize Devils Lake, has been a goal of the project. Therefore, in accordance with the 1986 Garrison Reformulation Act, the Bureau is directed to serve as a cooperating agency with the Corps of Engineers in the development of a Devils Lake stabilization watershed management plan.

Science and technology, water technology and environmental research.—Within the amount recommended for water technology and environmental research, up to $250,000 is to continue studies related to mine water treatment and related problems in the greater Leadville, CO, area.

The Committee is aware of the need and desire to investigate and demonstrate the use of desalting technologies to improve ground water quality using well-head treatment. Because of the uncertainties related to scope, cost (including cost sharing), and authority, the Committee believes that the Bureau should use up to $200,000 in available funds to participate in comprehensive planning studies and recommendation on a possible pilot plant demonstration effort which would produce data under a broad range of conditions and locations. Upon completion of appropriate studies and a favorable recommendation by the Bureau to the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate, the Committee would consider a reprogramming request for the Bureau to participate in the pilot plant work.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1990	$209,315,000
Budget estimate, 1991	231,516,000
House allowance	231,516,000
Committee recommendation	231,516,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $231,516,000, the same as the House allowance and budget request.

The appropriation recommended under this heading provides for the operation and maintenance of 37 projects, project areas, or divisions of projects in fiscal year 1989. Projects are operated for power production, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation, flood control, and other benefits.

Provision is also made for administration of water marketing contracts on Corps of Engineers projects, examination of existing structures, and administration of the provisions of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 1261).

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1990	$33,644,000
Budget estimate, 1991	5,708,000
House allowance	5,708,000
Committee recommendation	5,708,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,708,000. This is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

This appropriation provides for loans to non-Federal organizations for construction and rehabilitation of distribution systems and for loans and grants to construct small irrigation projects.

The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 was enacted for the purpose of encouraging local participation by qualified organizations in the development of small reclamation projects and to provide Federal assistance in the development of similar projects by non-Federal organizations.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

LOAN PROGRAM

Project title	Total Federal cost	Fiscal year 1991 budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
MONTANA				
Middle Creek Dam rehabilitation project	$3,774,000	$2,944,000	$2,944,000	$2,944,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1990	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM					
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS					
ARIZONA					
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT	52,000,000	38,489,079	8,872,000	8,872,000	8,872,000
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT PROJECT [SAWRSA].......	27,553,000	5,916,000	11,177,000	11,177,000	11,177,000
CALIFORNIA					
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:					
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT............................	2,164,041,000	346,287,221	1,500,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS......................	693,906,000	641,130,079	2,400,000	2,600,000	2,400,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION...........................	365,868,000	318,133,055	3,866,000	3,866,000	3,866,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION.................................	349,570,000	301,728,374	1,715,000	1,715,000	1,715,000
SAN LUIS UNIT.......................................	1,354,922,000	557,553,044	2,911,000	2,911,000	2,911,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM...................	302,742,000	274,585,032	7,362,000	7,362,000	7,362,000
COLORADO					
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP...................	263,854,000	77,115,958	14,732,000	14,732,000	14,732,000
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP...........	169,338,000	2,740,581	4,726,000	4,726,000	4,726,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.................	87,280,000	55,800,743	3,380,000	3,380,000	3,380,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION........	94,000,000	81,351,342	6,810,000	6,810,000	6,810,000
NEBRASKA					
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP............................	348,610,000	266,830,507	21,646,000	21,646,000	21,646,000
O'NEILL UNIT, P-SMBP...................................	173,200,000	8,857,115	600,000	600,000	600,000
NORTH DAKOTA					
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT................................	---	---	---	30,000,000	35,000,000
OREGON					
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT.................................	---	---	---	7,052,000	7,052,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1990	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
SOUTH DAKOTA					
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	49,256,000	17,701,693	8,024,000	8,024,000	8,024,000
MNI WICONI RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	---	---	---	1,500,000	1,500,000
WEB RURAL WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	111,949,857	111,004,857	945,000	945,000	945,000
WASHINGTON					
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:					
IRRIGATION FACILITIES	4,310,476,184	1,670,090,494	3,900,000	4,300,000	3,900,000
THIRD POWERPLANT, GRAND COULEE DAM	747,420,184	744,072,184	3,348,000	5,348,000	5,348,000
WYOMING					
BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP	80,150,000	61,299,747	11,930,000	11,930,000	11,930,000
VARIOUS					
BOULDER CANYON PROJECT	65,000,000	17,825,512	23,920,000	23,920,000	23,920,000
MEASURES BELOW IMPERIAL DAM, TITLE I, CRBSCP	481,536,000	368,586,723	14,295,000	14,295,000	14,295,000
SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION			158,059,000	199,461,000	203,861,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
ARBUCKLE PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	---	---	---	500,000	500,000
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO	36,287,000	29,818,264	1,980,000	1,980,000	1,980,000
~~BRANTLEY~~ PROJECT, NEW MEXICO	141,432,605	140,932,605	500,000	500,000	500,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT, WA	89,086,000	85,104,121	739,000	739,000	739,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK & LEVEE SYSTEM, AR, CO	118,403,000	65,152,579	6,300,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES ACT., ID,ND,NE,MT,ORE,SD,WA,WY	2,535,000	1,412,582	75,000	75,000	75,000
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO	508,186,436	506,146,436	1,470,000	1,470,000	1,470,000
GERING IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NEBRASKA	---	---	---	100,000	---
GILA PROJECT, ARIZONA	78,115,000	77,116,136	368,000	368,000	368,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA	54,100,000	44,742,018	1,186,000	1,186,000	1,186,000
LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL, COLORADO	16,096,000	8,604,977	3,360,000	3,360,000	3,360,000
MCGEE CREEK, PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	119,484,492	118,894,492	500,000	500,000	500,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT	4,057,000	969,945	702,000	702,000	702,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA	32,913,000	7,658,963	950,000	950,000	950,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:					
EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA	24,230,000	23,479,478	50,000	50,000	50,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1990	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA	43,036,000	41,867,827	460,000	730,000	730,000
OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA	490,000,000	42,298,425	65,000	65,000	65,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING	7,006,000	6,772,762	15,000	15,000	15,000
RECREATION FACILITIES AT EXISTING RESERVOIRS,VARIOUS	315,000	---	315,000	315,000	315,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT, NM	25,544,000	10,267,000	---	---	500,000
WASHOE PROJECT, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	362,117,000	43,076,486	305,000	305,000	305,000
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT, VARIOUS	20,000,000	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE AND PROTECTIVE FACILITIES, WASH.	43,006,000	37,756,297	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION			25,240,000	26,110,000	26,510,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:					
BIA - DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	142,655,000	---	9,055,000	---	---
BOISE PROJECT, DEER FLAT DAM, IDAHO	27,900,000	2,859,000	17,225,000	17,225,000	17,225,000
CACHUMA PROJECT, BRADBURY DAM, CALIFORNIA	60,260,000	99,000	280,000	280,000	280,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, SAN LUIS UN.,O'NEILL DAM, CA	2,475,000	44,000	1,980,000	1,980,000	1,980,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	7,477,550	4,527,554	650,000	650,000	650,000
HYRUM PROJECT, UTAH	2,316,273	866,273	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	145,521,000	7,220,000	16,725,000	16,725,000	16,725,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, JACKSON LAKE DAM, IDAHO-WYOMING	76,537,647	76,128,647	409,000	409,000	409,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS AND PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY	53,561,253	40,553,253	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, BARTLETT DAM, ARIZONA	68,733,000	1,476,000	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSESHOE DAM, ARIZONA	32,867,000	1,476,000	850,000	850,000	850,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA	37,349,942	29,814,718	3,394,000	3,394,000	3,394,000
SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION - COOLIDGE DAM, AZ	49,500,000	2,378,139	5,130,000	5,130,000	5,130,000
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT, ALTUS DAM, OKLAHOMA	11,365,000	2,193,298	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS			67,348,000	58,293,000	58,293,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:					
BOSTWICK IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NE	---	---	---	150,000	150,000
HIGHLAND-HANOVER DIVISION, P-SMBP, WY	300,000	148,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
HYRUM PROJECT, UTAH	2,100,000	885,496	786,000	786,000	786,000
MILK RIVER, GLASGOW DIVISION, MT	2,050,000	89,000	410,000	410,000	410,000
MILK RIVER, MALTA DIVISION, MT	5,600,000	221,000	560,000	560,000	560,000
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT, UTAH	11,869,000	1,611,000	1,954,000	1,954,000	1,954,000
SARGENT IRRIGATION DISTRICT, P-SMBP, NE	---	---	---	200,000	200,000
UPPER BLUFF DIVISION, P-SMBP, WY	220,000	108,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH	9,900,000	945,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT			6,170,000	6,520,000	6,520,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1990	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY:					
COLORADO RIVER BRIDGE CROSSING......................	45,000,000	677,402	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:					
ATMOSPHERIC WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM......	---	---	---	3,200,000	---
GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE...............................	28,220,000	---	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM..........	28,339,147	11,105,147	4,503,000	4,503,000	4,503,000
WATER TECHNOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH.........	201,896,130	87,995,310	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
SUBTOTAL, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.................			13,303,000	16,503,000	13,303,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS..			271,120,000	307,887,000	308,987,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT					
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND					
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS					
COLORADO					
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT.............................	340,233,500	15,613,205	13,415,000	13,415,000	13,415,000
DOLORES PROJECT.....................................	458,839,000	343,760,872	49,050,000	49,050,000	49,050,000
UTAH					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT................	1,693,067,072	1,029,392,100	81,773,000	81,773,000	81,773,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT....................	198,542,000	5,821,501	50,000	50,000	50,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, JENSEN UNIT, UTAH...........	70,299,000	60,547,493	30,000	30,000	30,000
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT, COLORADO....................	130,739,000	118,306,002	745,000	745,000	745,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:					
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES............................	178,525,991	124,908,655	11,836,000	11,836,000	11,836,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES.......................	262,439,255	79,648,542	15,132,000	15,132,000	15,132,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT.............			172,031,000	172,031,000	172,031,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1990	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT					
ARIZONA					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, WATER DEVELOPMENT [LCRBDF]...	2,938,252,000	2,189,376,045	182,268,000	185,768,000	182,268,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, NON-INDIAN DISTR. SYSTEMS....	297,637,000	238,068,134	1,996,000	1,996,000	1,996,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA-SAFETY OF DAMS........................	71,895,000	27,319,457	14,202,000	14,202,000	14,202,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT...............			198,466,000	201,966,000	198,466,000
ASSOCIATED ITEMS					
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	---	-32,187,000	-32,187,000	-38,957,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.......................			609,430,000	649,697,000	641,027,000

LOAN PROGRAM—Continued

Project title	Total Federal cost	Fiscal year 1991 budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TEXAS				
Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 1 suppl	12,972,000	2,002,000	2,002,000	2,002,000
VARIOUS				
Administration of the loan program	15,751,506	762,000	762,000	762,000
Total, loan program		5,708,000	5,708,000	5,708,000

LOAN PROGRAM

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

Appropriations, 1990	($31,475,000)
Budget estimate, 1991	(4,946,000)
House allowance	(4,946,000)
Committee recommendation	(4,946,000)

The Committee recommends a loan limitation of $4,946,000.

This limitation provides control over the gross obligations for the principal amount of loans that may be made under the loan program in fiscal year 1991.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1990	$47,311,000
Budget estimate, 1991	51,431,000
House allowance	51,431,000
Committee recommendation	51,431,000

An appropriation of $51,431,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

This appropriation finances the general administrative and technical direction of the reclamation program as performed by the Commissioner's office, Denver office, and other offices in the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation.

EMERGENCY FUND

Appropriations, 1990	$986,000
Budget estimate, 1991	1,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,000,000 which is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

This fund is used to assure continuous operation of all projects and project facilities governed by Federal reclamation law in the event of drought, canal bank failure, electrical system failures, municipal and industrial water delivery system failures, or other emergencies.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Appropriations, 1990	$8,381,000
Budget estimate, 1991	4,831,000
House allowance	4,831,000
Committee recommendation	4,831,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $4,831,000 for the working capital fund of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The fund provides for more efficient financing and financial management of centralized administrative services and acquisition of the business acquisition project and other capital equipment for support of Bureau programs and for work performed for others.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in the bill provide for Department of Energy programs relating to energy supply, research, and development activities including biological and environmental research, and basic energy sciences and supporting research and technical analysis; uranium supply and enrichment activities; general science and research activities; civilian nuclear waste fund; environmental restoration and waste management, both defense and nondefense; atomic energy defense activities; departmental administration; power marketing activities; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the geothermal resources development fund.

DOE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL CAPABILITY

The Department of Energy maintains our Nation's great scientific capability through the national laboratories and other DOE-related institutions. These are an invaluable resource of mathematical, scientific, and engineering expertise that should be tapped to promote competitiveness through joint scientific and technological ventures with industry and academia and to improve the education of America's youth. The Committee once again urges the Department, and specifically the national laboratories, to actively seek areas of cooperation with the National Science Foundation, the Department of Education, and other departments, agencies, and universities to coordinate and maximize the use of the Nation's research dollars, facilities, and manpower in such joint ventures.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

In addition, the Department and the laboratories should take such steps as are necessary to improve the transfer of technology and the results of research and development to the marketplace. The DOE management is also urged to review the current framework, processes, and programs used for R&D laboratory technology transfer.

DOE EDUCATION INITIATIVES

The Committee is aware that the Secretary of Energy has proposed numerous initiatives to expand use of the facilities, equipment, personnel, and other resources of the Department of Energy to enhance educational opportunities in science, mathematics, and engineering for American students and educators. The Secretary and the Committee recognize the critical need to assure that a strong corps of highly qualified mathematicians, scientists, engineers, and technicians will be available to staff the Department in the future. Both the Secretary and the Committee also recognize the importance of enhancing the scientific literacy of the Nation.

The administration's budget request for fiscal year 1991 cites the Department's interest in funding laboratory cooperative science centers at the national laboratories. These centers would support exciting laboratory-based, and offsite, educational experiences for teachers and students. The Department is also requesting funding to carry out university-based programs directed at encouraging more young people, including minorities and women, to pursue energy-related scientific and technical careers.

The Committee supports these efforts to capitalize upon the unique resources of the Department so as to improve the scientific literacy and competitiveness of the Nation. A new general provision is included in the bill which addresses these initiatives.

DECLINE OF NUCLEAR INDUSTRIAL BASE

The Committee is concerned about the impending erosion of the industrial base which supports the American nuclear community. This capacity is essential for the most efficient deployment of nuclear technologies at Department facilities and in the private sector. Without a variety of manufacturers, suppliers, and vendors in this field, purchasers of nuclear systems, including the Department of Energy, may encounter unanticipated costs and delays. The Committee expects the Department to utilize nuclear-related funding in a manner which encourages a competitive and diversified industrial base. This applies to funds provided in the "Atomic energy defense" appropriation also.

Energy Supply, Research, and Development Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1990	$1,916,768,000
Budget estimate, 1991	1,788,606,000
House allowance	2,362,722,000
Committee recommendation	2,405,065,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1990	$267,681,000
Budget estimate, 1991	296,631,000
House allowance	340,550,000
Committee recommendation	340,550,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,745,615,000 for energy supply, research, and development activities. The purpose of these funds is to support the development of new energy technologies and improve the efficiency of existing technologies. Included are the development and demonstration of solar energy, wind, ocean systems, biomass, geothermal, nuclear fission and fusion, electric energy systems, and energy storage. Efforts associated with basic energy sciences and environmental and biological research are also included.

These programs address the development of both short- and longer-term energy supply options to provide the energy resources needed for sustained national growth and to alleviate our dependence on fossil fuels and foreign oil.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS

The President's budget proposes an increase of over $22,000,000 over the current year's level of funding of $92,400,000 for a total fiscal year 1991 request of $115,873,000 for solar and renewable energy activities. This budget request is a substantial improvement and reverses the downward trend in these programs which have been substantially curtailed over the last 8 years—from about $550,000,000 in 1981 to the fiscal year 1990 proposal of $71,156,000.

The Committee agrees that the marketplace must ultimately decide the future role of the solar and renewable technologies. Most solar and renewables research, however, has not been developed to the point where the private sector alone can be expected to carry forward with its development.

The Committee considers the continuation of activities in solar energy research and development to be a vital component in a balanced energy program. With a sustained commitment of the scientific and engineering talents in Government and private sector organizations, research progress can establish the knowledge and materials base required for the effective application of a new generation of solar technologies.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends program funds and staffing levels to assure progress in this research activity. The Committee recommendation for solar energy is $129,673,000 which is $14,000,000 above the budget.

Solar building systems.—The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for solar building energy systems, $2,000,000 above the budget request and the House allowance. These additional funds will continue the current work in solar cooling research at the Florida Solar Energy Center, industry/State government solar standards inclusion in Federal housing loan programs and information for Government procurement officials and other potential purchasers and public education on solar heating and cooling. These transition funds are provided in anticipation of the expected transfer of most of these efforts to the DOE conservation program, which is funded by another subcommittee.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The recommendation includes $46,900,000 for photovoltaic energy systems, which is an increase of $3,300,000 over the budget request and over $12,000,000 above the 1990 level. Of this recommended appropriation, $9,000,000 is to be used for a manufacturers initiative for U.S. manufacturers to scale-up production of photovoltaics; $500,000 is included to continue the Southeast and Southwest regional experiment stations on photovoltaic technologies; and funds are included to maintain research for concentrator, one-sun and the design assistance center at Sandia National Laboratory. Rather than specify a specific technology for increased funding, the Committee urges the Department to expedite development of the several attractive technologies for photovoltaic energy conversion to help maintain international competitiveness by U.S. manufacturers of photovoltaic technologies.

The Committee supports the manufacturing initiative as proposed in the request. The Committee is acutely aware of the need for trained professionals in the area, and recognizes that the Nation must look to its universities to educate and motivate technical professionals in manufacturing. Thus, the Committee believes the Department must have the participation of universities in the manufacturing initiative.

The Committee further recognizes that university facilities for photovoltaic research are outdated and inadequate. Therefore, the Department of Energy is to allocate $500,000 for the purchase of photovoltaic research equipment by universities.

This recommended funding level will continue the highest priority requirements needed to continue progress in reducing costs and improving efficiencies of photovoltaic systems. Research must be maintained in high technology industries such as the photovoltaic industry if we are to remain competitive in the international marketplace. In the last few years, the U.S. share of the international photovoltaics market fell from over 80 percent to nearly 50 percent. The Japanese market share almost doubled.

As in the past years, the Committee expects the Department to maintain a balanced program of advanced research, materials research, technology development, and systems development.

Solar thermal energy systems.—The Committee recommends $19,500,000 for solar thermal energy to maintain the capability to support the continuation of research both in the DOE laboratories and in the private sector. Of the amount provided, not more than $4,000,000 is for short-term commercialization of solar detoxification and solar flux research and development and not less than $10,000,000 is for short-term commercialization activities in solar trough and dish/engine technologies.

The goal of this program is to advance the engineering and scientific understanding of solar thermal technology and to establish the technology base from which private industry can develop solar thermal production options for introduction into the energy market. These funds are to be applied to collection technology, energy conversion technology, and systems and application technology.

Biofuels energy systems.—The Committee recommends $32,500,000 for the biofuels energy systems program which is an increase of $4,500,000 over the budget request.

The goal of this program is to conduct research that will provide the technology to increase the supply of domestically available feedstocks and convert those feedstocks to liquid and gaseous fuels.

The Committee recommendation includes the House-passed allocation of $750,000 for production research, harvesting/processing conversion and market analysis for the Hawaii biofuels program at the Hawaii Natural Energy Institute. Funding of $4,500,000 is allocated for the regional biofuels program which needs greater emphasis on transferring technologies to the private sector. These regional programs include activities related to technology transfer, industry support, resource assessment, and matching local resources to conversion technologies, while noting that the existing focus on commercial direct combustion technologies should be continued.

Wind energy systems.—The recommendation provides $10,600,000 for the wind energy program, $2,000,000 more than the budget request. These additional funds will provide for work on the Advanced Wind Turbine Program in the 200 to 750 kilowatt range in cooperation with the private sector. The Committee agrees with the House allocation of $2,000,000 for a program to be carried out in cooperation with the private sector, to seek new commercial opportunities, both domestically and internationally for wind energy.

Ocean energy systems.—The Committee provides $2,000,000 for the ocean energy system. The objective of the Ocean Energy Program is to develop a generic technical data base and reduce the technical risks associated with the extraction and use of ocean-derived energy sources to the point that allows industry to judge where and when the technology could be commercialized. Ocean thermal energy conversion may provide a clean, unlimited source of energy, which also provides for aquaculture and fresh water.

Other solar programs.—The recommendation includes $4,500,000 as requested in the budget for a solar energy research facility at the Solar Energy Research Institute [SERI] in Golden, CO. The Committee urges the Department of Energy and SERI to incorporate energy conservation, passive solar design, and solar thermal and electric equipment as an integral, as opposed to a demonstration, part of the structure. If such designs and equipment are judged to be cost/competitive and congruent with the primary purpose of the building, they should be installed consonant with the philosophy expressed in section 801(a)1, chapter 141, title X, U.S.C. section 2394 pertaining to the procurement of solar by the Department of Defense in its own projects when cost effective. The Department and SERI shall keep the Committee advised on the extent of solar and energy-saving technologies used in the building and the life-cycle cost savings of these technologies.

The Committee recommendation also provides $1,500,000 for the Federal interagency export board. The Committee on Renewable Energy Commerce and Trade [CORECT], to support industry export initiatives and overseas liaison offices.

GEOTHERMAL

The Geothermal Research and Development Program is aimed at resolving technical problems that preclude the private sector from fully developing our vast geothermal resources. The Committee recommends $27,600,000 for geothermal activities, an increase of $5,000,000 over the House allowance.

Geothermal resources include steam, hot water, geopressured methane, hot dry rock, and magma. The geothermal energy research and development program is aimed at resolving the technical problems, which include uncertainties in determining size and life of reservoirs, unusually high drilling costs and lack of well stimulation techniques, the need for injection technology for economic disposal of spent brines, major corrosion and materials problems, environmental problems, and lack of efficient components.

The Committee recognizes the complex nature of the geothermal resource base and the need for developing improved analytical and testing capabilities. The Committee supports continuation of research activities to improve the tools and methods available for addressing the technical challenges associated with locating, evaluating, and extracting geothermal resources.

The recommendation includes $6,000,000 for geopressured resources, to continue the existing contract work in three field wells: Pleasant Bayou, Hulin, and Gladys McCall, to be used to resolve technical issues on production of hydrocarbons and brine and generation of electricity using the energy content of the produced fluids.

The Committee recommendation also includes $5,000,000 for the State of Hawaii through its department of business and economic development to continue the Hawaii geothermal resource verification and characterization projects to help reduce the State's dependency on fossil fuels. The State of Hawaii has assured the Committee that this cost-shared assessment will be conducted consistent with the State's outstanding effort to protect and preserve its unique natural resources.

The Committee has included $1,500,000 to provide for a low temperature geothermal resource assessment and evaluation for direct/heat utilization as proposed by the Oregon Institute of Technology, University of Utah Research Institute, and the Idaho Water Resources Research Institute.

The conference report accompanying the fiscal year 1989 bill directed the Department of Energy to use funds deobligated from the Baca geothermal demonstration project for ongoing geothermal work. The Committee notes that the required work has been accomplished and that approximately $2,500,000 remains in funds deobligated from the Baca project. Therefore, these funds shall be used as follows: $300,000 to continue the technology assistance contract at the GeoHeat Institute; $1,000,000 for reservoir investigations and the siting and drilling of an injection well, and further development of the geothermal district heating systems operated by Boise City and the Boise Warm Springs Water District; and $1,000,000 to cooperate with industry efforts to maintain production at The Geysers geothermal field.

For the purposes of demonstrating the viability of utilizing hot dry rock geothermal technology for the generation of electricity in Arizona, the Committee has allocated up to $367,500, to be equally matched with non-Federal funding, be made available from within existing funds for the State of Arizona through its department of commerce.

HYDROPOWER

The Committee has approved the administration's request of $1,000,000 for the hydropower program.

The Committee believes that hydropower is an important domestic renewable energy resource, and supports the maximum utilization of hydropower resources consistent with established environmental policies. The present hydropower licensing process has created duplicate responsibilities among multiple agencies, resulting in excessive licensing and relicensing delays, costs, and uncertainty. The Committee is concerned that this valuable energy resource may be underutilized because of the current regulatory regime and that the threat of the loss of capacity through the relicensing process means that it is no longer possible to incorporate hydropower resources in future capacity plans with confidence. To begin the remedy of these problems, the Secretary is urged to establish a hydropower office within the Office of Policy and Planning and funds are made available to be used for the following objectives: (1) To advocate the use of hydropower as a domestic resource in national energy policy planning; (2) to work with other Federal and State agencies to eliminate duplication of regulatory roles and to work with other Federal and State agencies to foster cooperation between competing river uses; and (3) to coordinate hydropower energy policy objectives with the Director of Renewable Energy Technologies to encourage research and development of cost-effective mitigation measures that adequately protect the environment while not hampering hydropower development.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

The Committee recommends $41,253,000, the same amount as the House, for electric energy systems and electric energy storage.

The electric energy systems and storage program includes research in determining the effects of electric power transmission on humans and animals; development of technology for improving the reliability of the transmission and distribution of electricity; and research and development in systems technology and thermal and chemical storage.

Electric energy systems.—A total of $28,347,000 is provided for electric energy systems, $1,000,000 more than the budget request and the House allowance.

The Committee allocation for electrical field effects research is increased to $3,500,000 to upgrade the level of DOE research on the interaction of electromagnetic energy with biological systems. An increasing concern is the potential health effects results from exposure to electrical or magnetic fields. These additional funds will advance important research and studies conducted by the Department of Energy.

The Committee recommendation is to concur in the House allowance of $3,500,000 to complete a high phase order electric transmission demonstration project expanding on the preliminary engineering and environmental work performed by the Department of Energy in connection with the Empire State Electric Energy Research Corp., and the New York State Electric & Gas Co.

Energy storage systems.—An amount of $12,906,000 is included for energy storage, the same as the budget request. The recommendation includes $1,050,000 to continue work on the aluminum/metal-air battery system; and $2,500,000 is included for the thermal energy storage research program. This latter effort includes both diurnal and industrial thermal energy storage and seasonal thermal energy storage to help ensure that research and development support for U.S. firms will maintain international competitiveness in this important energy storage program.

Within available funds, the Committee directs no less than $900,000 from the Energy Storage Program for the development of an AC battery module advanced conversion system to be demonstrated at the existing utility DOE-funded PVUSA facility on a cost-shared basis in order to accelerate renewable energy advanced electric storage.

No funds are included in the Committee recommendation for proton exchange membrane fuel cell technology which is funded by another subcommittee.

NUCLEAR ENERGY R&D PROGRAM

A total of $329,790,000 is provided for the Nuclear Energy Research and Development Program, $20,000,000 more than the House allowance and $48,000,000 less than the budget request.

The Committee is concerned about the impending erosion of the industrial base which supports the American nuclear community. This capacity is essential for the most efficient deployment of nuclear technologies at Department facilities and in the private sector. Without a variety of manufacturers, suppliers, and vendors in this field, purchasers of nuclear systems, including the Department of Energy, may encounter unanticipated costs and delays. The Committee expects the Department to utilize nuclear-related funding in a manner which encourages a competitive and diversified industrial base. This applies to funds provided in the "Atomic energy defense" appropriation also.

Funds are included for civilian reactor research, space and defense power systems, and civilian waste research and development. The administration has proposed establishing a new appropriation for environmental and waste management and has included approximately $420,000,000 of programs that were previously funded under nuclear. The funding for environmental restoration and waste management is discussed later in this report.

Light water reactors [LWR].—An amount of $41,500,000 is recommended for improved LWR technology, which is $10,000,000 more than the House allowance and the same as the budget request.

The Committee has approved the amended budget request which provides a $10,000,000 increase to permit the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations [INPO] to evaluate and make recommendations to improve the operational safety of civilian reactors in the Soviet Union. This initiative of the Secretary and the President was transmitted to the Congress in an amended budget request in late June. In view of the potential consequences of another serious nuclear accident in the Soviet Union on the world's environment, as well as the future acceptability of nuclear power as a viable energy source, the administration believes that assistance to INPO to carry out this initiative is urgently required. Western nations depend upon nuclear power to furnish between 20 and 70 percent of their electricity supplies. Thus, the energy security of the Western World, as well as the East, could be adversely affected by another reactor accident in the Soviet Union. This initiative is being carried out under the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy Agreement.

Advanced lightwater reactor certification.—The Committee supports the Department's efforts to work with the electric power industry to develop and certify designs for advanced nuclear reactors with inherent safety features. The Department has committed to support light water reactor design certification work on such projects which will be shared with the electric power industry and development teams. Key elements to the viability and public acceptance of this new generation of reactors are standardization and modular construction which will make extensive use of prefabrication and assembly of components under factory conditions prior to transportation to the reactor site. Modular engineering is as essential as design certification by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission since it will provide certainty that reactors can be built on time and within budget. The Committee understands the vendor teams involved are willing to pay back Federal funds invested in modular and first-time engineering costs from royalties based on the plants built as a result of these efforts. The Committee urges the Department to evaluate the need for Federal funding of first-time engineering and to make a recommendation as part of its fiscal year 1992 budget request.

Advanced reactor research and development.—The Committee recommends $72,000,000 for advanced reactor R&D, $13,244,000 more than the fiscal year 1990 allowance. The Committee recommendation agrees with the budget request for the high temperature gas reactor [HTGR] and includes $25,000,000 to continue the current program. An increase of $17,000,000 over the budget request is provided for the Argonne National Laboratory [ANL] in Idaho for the integral fast reactor program. An additional $5,000,000 is recommended for the Advanced Liquid Metal Reactor Program. In addition, $3,000,000 is for the Advanced Control Test Operation [ACTO] Program and $1,000,000 is for the shielding work, both activities at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The Committee concurs with the continuation of funding for the University Research Program in Robotics for Advanced Reactors as proposed by the House.

Space and defense power systems.—The Committee recommends $31,500,000 for space and defense power systems, the same as the current level instead of the budget increase of $18,000,000. This includes funds for the SP-100 program operating and capital expenses, for isotope power systems and for the multimegawatt power systems, including continued development of thermionic technology. Budget allocation constraints will continue to require other departments and agencies to come up with their fair share of the costs of these activities.

Advanced nuclear systems.—The Committee recommends $75,500,000 which is the same as the House allowance and the budget request. These funds are used to provide support for NASA and DOD missions. Budget allocation constraints will continue to require other agencies to help offset the cost of these efforts.

Facilities.—The Committee recommendation provides a total of $100,490,000 for the facilities account. This allowance is a decrease of about $40,000,000 below the budget request.

The House-passed bill provides for the continued operation of the fast flux test reactor [FFTF] in fiscal year 1991. The Committee recommendation is to agree with the House action providing funding of the reactor in the environmental restoration and waste management program.

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Committee recommends $8,000,000, the same as the amended budget request, to provide staffing and support for this newly established office in the Department of Energy. This organization reports directly to the Secretary and was established to monitor and audit all aspects of nuclear safety, including field office and contractor performance. This office will also review and concur in nuclear reactor and nonreactor nuclear facility safety policies and will be responsible for enforcement policy and programs associated with the civil and criminal penalty authority of the Price/Anderson Act Amendments of 1988.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

The Committee recommends $106,421,000 for environment, safety, and health activities, an increase of $9,000,000 over the House appropriation.

The Environment, Safety and Health [ES&H] Program was established to assure protection of the environment, safety of DOE workers and the public, and protection of DOE property. The ES&H Program implements these goals by defining DOE policy, providing guidance and technical assistance, performing safety-related research of a generic nature and performing independent overview and assessment.

The allowance includes the amended budget request of $9,000,000, of which $7,500,000 is to fund the newly established Office of Health and $1,500,000 is to conduct a joint project to study the effects of air pollution in Mexico City, as requested by the Secretary of Energy and the President.

The Office of Health will develop and recommend policies and standards related to radiation protection, industrial hygiene, and occupational medicine for utilization in DOE facilities. In addition, the Office will maintain health surveillance data and analyses through the implementation of an epidemiology program for DOE employees, contract workers, and communities adjacent to departmental facilities; provide independent internal oversight of DOE's occupational health programs; and manage and oversee a program to assure long-term analytical, epidemiological studies outside of DOE and ensure communication of all health study findings to DOE employees, contractor employees, and unions, and the public.

The research project with the Mexican Government is recommended as proposed by the administration which is expected to provide information which will be mutually beneficial to both countries as we attempt to more fully understand the impact of various energy options on the environment.

LIQUEFIED GASEOUS FUELS SPILL TEST FACILITY

The Committee recommends $1,085,000 to continue baseline operations support and for facility maintenance, research and development, and technical interaction with potential sponsors of research. This is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommends $396,394,000 for biological and environmental research, $25,000,000 over the House-passed allowance.

This program has two main objectives: (1) To develop the knowledge base necessary to identify, understand, and anticipate the long-term health and environmental consequences of energy use and development; and (2) to utilize the Department's unique scientific and technological capabilities to solve major scientific problems in medicine and biology. The Committee supports the House allocation and projects as contained in the House report accompanying this appropriation bill for the facilities and projects under the biological and environmental research program.

Global change.—The Department is to accelerate research in the area of early detection of the greenhouse effect in the atmosphere and in the determination of definitive quantitative links between the increase of greenhouse gases and the symptoms of global warming. It is necessary to eliminate or reduce scientific uncertainties over data and the causal link between CO_2 and temperature rise. These efforts are to be conducted in fiscal year 1990 at a level of $65,900,000, an increase of $16,000,000 above the fiscal year 1990 appropriation and the same as the President's request. The Committee agrees with the House action.

Human genome project.—The study of the human genome, the genetic instructions for the development and functioning of the human body, increases in fiscal year 1991.

The short-term goal of the DOE human genome program is to provide the computational, engineering, and biological capabilities needed to both reduce the cost of analysis of DNA as well as increase the speed of analysis. The long-term goal is to construct high resolution physical maps of the human chromosomes, the ultimate map being the DNA sequence. DOE's research on the human genome stems from the Department's mission to evaluate the health effects of energy systems. DOE is spending $26,000,000 on the human genome program this fiscal year and is requesting $46,000,000 for human genome research in fiscal year 1991.

DOE and the National Institutes of Health are the two Federal agencies with primary responsibility for the human genome initiative. The DOE centers for this genome research are the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, and the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

The Committee strongly supports the Department of Energy's role in the human genome project and the full budget request of $46,000,000 is approved. However, the Committee is disappointed that the Department does not have a greater role as it is uniquely qualified to do more because of its national laboratories strength in technology development and management of multidisciplinary scientific projects. Because the Committee believes that the Department of Energy can make a greater contribution to the effort to map and eventually sequence the human genome, it urges the DOE management to seek a more active and greater role for the Department in this effort.

Nuclear medicine program.—The Committee has approved the full budget request for the nuclear medicine program. The program has yielded a significant return on investment in terms of vastly improved diagnostic and therapeutic technologies that are rapidly transferred to the clinical setting. These advances not only improve the quality of medical care for thousands of people across the country, but they also reduce total U.S. health care expenditures by reducing hospitalization time, improving the diagnostic process, and often obviating the need for more costly, more invasive therapies such as cardiac catheterization and bypass surgery. The program has produced remarkable technological breakthroughs with a relatively small budget.

Boron neutron capture therapy.—The Committee has approved an increase over the budget request for the Boron Neutron Capture Therapy Program at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory. These funds, together with available funds for the Power Burst Facility [PBF] will provide a total of $13,500,000 which shall be used to begin reactor modification and additional research. The Committee recommendation is the same as the allowance in the House-passed bill. The Department of Energy shall start this activity prior to the end of fiscal year 1991. Research results to date in the program have been positive and provide encouragement that a viable, glioblasteoma, and melanoma cancer therapy will be developed. The Committee directs that other institutions conducting BNCT research shall receive the remaining energy research funds which have been identified by the Department for BNCT research.

Facilities.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 for the Center for Nuclear Medicine Research in Alzheimer's Disease at the Health Sciences Center, West Virginia University. These funds will provide for facility preparation and acquisition of a positron emission tomography [PET] scanner and cyclotron. The center will be providing a similar amount of resources in facilities and support services. Positron emission tomography provides physiologic information about the brain and topographic localization of metabolic activities in the brain, and promises to be much more useful in diagnosing Alzheimer's disease than computed tomography [CT] and magnetic resonance imaging [MRI].

The Committee recommendation provides $6,000,000 to expand and consolidate basic and clinical research activities of the Cardiology Division and the Gazes Cardiac Research Institute at the Medical University of South Carolina. The construction and equipping of two floors will provide laboratories to conduct clinical research and outpatient diagnostic studies, examination of patients, cardiac epidemiology studies, and education and training. Both the clinical research and outpatient diagnostic studies will utilize nuclear isotopes and radioactive pharmaceuticals. The basic research laboratories will concentrate on heart failure in studies currently utilizing 12 different radioactive isotopes. It is the Committee's understanding that non-Federal contributions will be committed to the project and no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

The Committee recommends $12,500,000 for the Neurosensory Research Center at the Oregon Health Sciences University. This project was initiated last year and will provide a facility for new research and programs conducted on nerve communications at the cellular level; and will include interdisciplinary efforts combining computer information systems in the study of the brain and the nervous system at the molecular level.

The bill recommended by the Committee includes $12,500,000 for the Biomedical Research Institute at the Louisiana State University Medical Center, Shreveport, LA. These funds will continue this facility and center, which was initiated in fiscal year 1990, to conduct biomedical research in three specialized areas: cardiovascular disease, molecular biology, and neurobiology. The facility is connected to the existing LSU School of Medicine at Shreveport.

MAGNETIC FUSION

The goal of this program is to establish the scientific and technological base required for achieving magnetic fusion energy. The target for completion of magnetic fusion development is determined by the present technical, economic, and political uncertainties of energy supply. Given timescales for the resolution of these uncertainties, it follows that the scientific and technological base for fusion should be essentially available by the turn of the century.

The Committee has been advised of the Department's efforts to perform a high-level review of the goals and mission of the magnetic fusion program. The Committee welcomes this effort, however, the results of the review will not be available until the late fall of this year.

The Committee has also been advised of the scientific progress the fusion program has made in the past year. However, the Committee is disappointed in the length of time it is taking the Department to formulate a new fusion policy.

The Committee concurs with the Department's desire to defer construction of the CIT. A decision to proceed should be based on scientific readiness and the demonstration of burning deuterium and tritium in the tokamak fusion test reactor [TFTR]. The Committee has been informed that the TFTR has all the necessary hardware in place to handle tritium, that no additional containment structure is necessary, and that the Princeton community has approved the initiation of tritium experiments in their community. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department and PPPL to proceed at once with the DT experiment. Since this is the purpose for which the machine was designed and authorized the Committee directs this effort to be the highest priority at PPPL. The Committee believes that sufficient funding exists in the PPPL programs for this task, therefore, no funds shall be redirected from other facilities to fund the DT experiment. The Committee also supports U.S. participation in ITER and directs the Department to take the necessary actions to locate and expeditiously begin the engineering design activity [EDA] in the United States.

The Committee has provided $325,300,000 for the fusion program, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The budget request proposes $715,042,000 for supporting research and technical analysis including basic energy sciences, multiprogram facility support, oversight, analysis, and university support.

The Committee provides $794,635,000 for these activities, an increase of $79,000,000 over the budget request and $25,000,000 more than the House.

The Committee supports the House allocation of funds and projects in supporting research and technical analysis for new facilities as contained in the House report accompanying its appropriation bill.

Basic energy sciences.—A total of $721,275,000 is recommended for basic energy sciences, an increase of $73,000,000 above the budget request and $28,000,000 more than the House allowance, as shown in the following programs and activities.

Materials science.—The Committee recommends an additional $6,750,000 which, together with the $5,250,000 proposed in the budget, will provide for a total of $12,000,000 in fiscal year 1990 to continue research and development and preliminary engineering work leading to an advanced neutron source at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. No construction funding is proposed or approved.

In action on the fiscal year 1989 appropriation bill, the Committee approved additional funding for materials science to enhance the materials synthesis and processing research effort for the Department and its research laboratories with the objective of developing and commercializing new advance materials. The Committee requests the Department to establish a competitive program in materials synthesis and processing as a part of the Basic Energy Science Program. This responds to the National Research Council's 1989 material sciences and engineering study which found this matter to be crucial to the economy and defense of the United States. The program would establish one center of excellence with an initial funding level of $5,000,000 for programs and startup costs.

Of the amount recommended, the Committee has approved $250,000 to be made available to West Virginia University for the further planning of a proposed research center in the basic science of materials by design. This assistance will enable the proposed center to determine details on the types of research projects that are needed to be addressed through its research efforts and the budget requirements.

Chemical sciences.—The Committee remains interested in the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory [DIAL] at Mississippi State University. DIAL specializes in mobile, optically based instruments which measure and analyze chemical flows in industrial processes. This onsite analysis enables the improvement of efficiency and a reduction in emissions, including greenhouse emissions, from such plants. The conferees on the fiscal year 1990 energy and water bill instructed the Department to explore a cooperative agreement with DIAL to transfer this technology to the private sector. The Committee commends the Office of Energy Research for its efforts in this regard and directs the Office to continue its efforts to coordinate this agreement with other agencies within the Department. The Committee has also included $4,000,000 as the Federal 50 percent cost-share for DIAL.

Facilities construction: Chemical and geosciences.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $4,000,000 to provide for a new physical science center at Fort Hays State University, Fort Hays, KS. This facility, which would house the computing center and the departments of chemistry, earth sciences, and physics, will be unique in its capability to facilitate the use of computer simulations, two-way radio interactive video, computer disk technology, and accessibility to mainframe and external data bases. The facility will be linked into a planned regional fiber optics network to enable it to serve as a model for off-campus science instruction. Cost-sharing funds from the State and private sector will be made available for the project.

Energy biosciences.—The Committee has approved an increase of $2,000,000 for a total of $22,200,000 to increase biological research efforts and work through competitive grants.

Advanced energy projects.—It is expected that the next generation of computer chips will have submicron features. Last year, a submicron chip fabrication technique, known as x-ray lithography, was demonstrated by IBM at the National Synchrotron Light Source at Brookhaven National Laboratory. An intensive worldwide technology race is underway. To win, powerful manufacturing quality x-ray sources based on synchrotron radiation are needed. Several past congressional actions encouraged the development of U.S. technology for advanced chip fabrication. Continuing this initiative will transfer the technology of synchrotron x-ray sources from DOE laboratories to U.S. industry in about 2 years.

The Committee has approved $750,000 of the recommended appropriation for the Manufacturing Systems Engineering Research Center at Louisiana Tech University. The center, established in 1988 by the Louisiana Board of Regents and supported by the State; is advancing the knowledge base in micromanufacturing. The focus is applied research emphasizing the design and development, testing, assembly, and production of micron and submicron structures and devices. Its components include a linkage with the electron storage ring at the Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices [CAMD], performing work associated with the x-ray lithography micromachining capability at CAMD. Other research and development components of this new and revolutionary technology include biomedical engineering and technology transfer.

Cooperative and other programs.—Since 1981, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ana G. Mendez Education Foundation, and Jackson State University have had a cooperative arrangement designed to enhance computer science and scientific research at all three institutions. This consortium has had a major impact on the development of minority science faculties, who are making significant contributions in teaching and research. The Committee supports this effort.

Within available funds, the Committee recommends $4,000,000 in support of the Center for Energy and Environmental Education Facility at the University of Northern Iowa. These funds will be used for a state-of-the art resource center for teacher training, developing curriculum materials, and teaching methodologies; accessible by a full array of telecommunications and computer technology networks with a special emphasis on elementary education.

From within funds made available in applied mathematical science, basic energy sciences, and other energy programs in this account not otherwise discussed in this report, an amount equal to the current fiscal year 1990 amount is to be made available to continue the cooperative agreement between the Department of Energy and the Supercomputer Computations Research Institute [SCRI] located at Florida State University.

Education initiative.—The Committee has provided the full amended budget request of $5,000,000 for mathematics and science education initiatives sought by the Secretary of Energy and the President. These additional funds will support high priority science education initiatives that utilize existing and unique DOE facilities and laboratories to assist in the critically important national effort to strengthen and improve science and mathematics education fundamental to reproduction of qualified U.S. scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and technicians. The budget amendment proposed the transfer of these funds for these initiatives from the University Reactor Fuel Assistance Program due to the revised schedule for refueling and converting university reactors to low enriched uranium.

University research support.—The Committee recommendation provides $5,000,000 to be made available, on a competitive basis, to university nuclear engineering programs. These moneys are to be made available for graduate fellowships, direct research support, and educational support programs in the field of nuclear engineering. The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for upgrading and operating of university nuclear research and training reactors.

The Committee recommendation is to agree with the House action and allocation of funds for the EPSCoR planning grants and graduate traineeships and funds in the amount of $5,000,000 is approved to be made available, on a competitive basis, to university nuclear engineering programs. These moneys are to be made available for graduate fellowship, direct research support, and educational support programs in the field of nuclear engineering. The Committee further provides $1,000,000 to ensure that a significant university reactor upgrade program will be continued, as pressing needs of research reactor modernization have been conveyed to the Committee.

The Committee has been advised of the difficulties Clark Atlanta University is having in connection with its research center for science and technology, a project which was initiated by DOE's Office of Energy Research in 1983–84. This project began as an initiative to address and improve the underrepresentation of blacks in the energy-related sciences and engineering, under the President's Executive Order 12320 on historically black colleges and universities [HBCU's]. Congress appropriated a total of $12,000,000 in fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for construction and completion of facilities for the center. Subsequently, the project facility was redesigned in consultation with DOE to allow construction in two phases and additional funds are now required to complete the facility. The Committee urges the Department of Energy to assist Clark Atlanta University in the completion of the project as part of its new education initiatives assisting historically black colleges and universities.

Multiprogram facilities.—The recommendation includes $23,743,000 for multiprogram lab facilities support, the same as the budget request. These funds are also to be made available to support major single purpose energy laboratories facilities in fiscal year 1991, and the Department is urged to include support for these facilities in its future budgets.

Multiprogram Energy Lab Facility support.—The Committee has approved the proposed changes to the budget request submitted in late June. These adjustments are required to permit the Department to initiate construction of an urgently needed construction project, Building 90 rehabilitation, at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, which is considered a potentially life safety hazard in the event of another major earthquake in the bay area. The changes also realign funding in other projects to reflect a more appropriate funding profile for projects affected by Gramm-Rudman-Hollings in fiscal year 1990.

The Committee also recommends $3,000,000 of the basic energy science appropriation in fiscal year 1991 of the $5,000,000 needed for the Ames Laboratory technical and administrative services facility. The major single purpose energy laboratories facility needs and support were not included in the fiscal year 1991 budget request as urged by the Committee in action on last year's appropriation bill.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT (NONDEFENSE)

As discussed elsewhere in this report, the administration has proposed that a number of activities providing for environmental restoration and waste management be combined into a single appropriation. The Committee has no objection to the combination of these activities under a single manager, but does not recommend combining the defense and civilian work under a single appropriation. Accordingly, the Committee has included the civilian program proposed by the administration under the "Energy supply, research and development" appropriation and the defense program under the "Atomic energy defense" appropriation.

The Committee action recommends $513,685,000 which increases the proposed nondefense program by $84,000,000. This increase will provide for the full-year operation of the Fast Flux Test Facility [FFTF] and allow research to continue on a number of programs including research on actinide burning. The Committee remains concerned, however, about the long-term future missions for FFTF. For this reason, the Committee supports the efforts of a commercialization team assembled by the Governor of Washington State that is currently working to identify private sources who are willing to contribute to the operating costs of FFTF in exchange for valuable industrial and medical isotopes and irradiation services. It is anticipated that this marketing approach, over time, will help defray the Federal operating costs of the FFTF. The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $5,200,000 for the Environmental and Molecular Sciences Laboratory.

The Committee strongly urges the Department to expedite the program for environmental restoration and waste management.

Uranium mill tailings.—The Committee recommends $124,500,000 for the uranium mill tailings remedial action program, which is the level of the budget request.

The Committee expects that the funds provided for uranium mill tailings remedial cleanup activities will be effectively applied to those remediation sites where work is ongoing and near completion, as well as those sites that are ready to proceed in fiscal year 1991, except for emergency situations, where health and safety requirements dictate otherwise. The Committee further notes that the cooperation of the Bureau of Land Management and the States in many of the remedial action activities is essential to the expeditious and cost-effective completion of this work.

Nearly all of the funding and activity in this program have been associated with surface cleanup efforts. The fiscal year 1991 budget request includes only $1,000,000 for ground water contamination work. The Committee believes the Department should proceed with characterization and evaluation studies and work on ground water contamination as soon as possible. The Committee is advised that the Department considers ground water contamination at the Falls City, TX, site to be probably the worst of the sites nationwide. Therefore, the Department should consider a pilot program for the Falls City site and allocate additional funds to initiate this work in the upcoming fiscal year.

GENERAL REDUCTION

The Committee has restored the general reduction made by the House in connection with independent research and development funding.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

The Committee recommendation includes the proposed amended budget request to use $6,900,000 of prior year balances to partially offset increases proposed in this "Energy supply research and development" appropriation account contained in the late June budget amendment as transmitted to the Congress.

The following tabulation shows the Committee's recommendation by program for new budget authority in comparison with the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
SOLAR ENERGY				
I. Solar applications				
A. Solar building energy systems				
Operating expenses	3,958,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	3,000,000
Capital equipment	148,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Solar building energy systems	4,106,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	3,000,000
B. Photovoltaic energy systems				
Operating expenses	33,770,000	42,800,000	46,100,000	46,100,000
Capital equipment	887,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	34,657,000	43,600,000	46,900,000	46,900,000
C. Solar thermal energy systems				
Operating expenses	14,866,000	19,350,000	19,350,000	19,350,000
Capital equipment	148,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	15,014,000	19,500,000	19,500,000	19,500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Biofuels energy systems				
Operating expenses	15,401,000	27,000,000	35,057,000	31,500,000
Capital equipment	789,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Biofuels energy systems	16,190,000	28,000,000	36,057,000	32,500,000
E. Wind energy systems				
Operating expenses	8,930,000	8,400,000	11,600,000	10,400,000
Capital equipment	197,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	9,127,000	8,600,000	11,800,000	10,600,000
F. Ocean energy systems				
Operating expenses	3,980,000	---	---	2,000,000
Capital equipment	99,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Ocean energy systems	4,079,000	---	---	2,000,000
Subtotal, Solar applications	83,173,000	100,700,000	115,257,000	114,500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Other solar energy				
A. International solar energy program - OE........	1,028,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
B. Solar technology transfer				
Operating expenses............................	1,779,000	2,223,000	2,223,000	2,223,000
C. Solar Energy Research Institute				
Capital equipment.............................	475,000	410,000	410,000	410,000
Construction:				
General plant projects.......................	173,000	290,000	290,000	290,000
91-E-100 Solar energy research facility SERF.	---	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Subtotal, Construction........................	173,000	4,790,000	4,790,000	4,790,000
Subtotal, Solar Energy Research Institute.........	648,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000
D. Resource assessment				
Operating expenses............................	753,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
Capital equipment.............................	---	50,000	50,000	50,000
Subtotal, Resource assessment.....................	753,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Program support - OE	879,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
F. Program direction - OE	4,146,000	4,350,000	4,350,000	4,350,000
Subtotal, Other solar energy	9,233,000	15,173,000	15,173,000	15,173,000
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY	92,406,000	115,873,000	130,430,000	129,673,000
(Operating expenses)	(89,490,000)	(108,473,000)	(123,030,000)	(122,273,000)
(Capital equipment)	(2,743,000)	(2,610,000)	(2,610,000)	(2,610,000)
(Construction)	(173,000)	(4,790,000)	(4,790,000)	(4,790,000)
GEOTHERMAL				
I. Geopressured research				
Operating expenses	5,856,000	2,900,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
II. Geothermal technology development				
Operating expenses	10,963,000	13,795,000	15,295,000	20,295,000
Capital equipment	444,000	405,000	405,000	405,000
Subtotal, Geothermal technology development	11,407,000	14,200,000	15,700,000	20,700,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Program direction - OE	814,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	18,077,000	18,000,000	22,600,000	27,600,000
(Operating expenses)	(17,633,000)	(17,595,000)	(22,195,000)	(27,195,000)
(Capital equipment)	(444,000)	(405,000)	(405,000)	(405,000)
HYDROPOWER				
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE	---	920,000	920,000	920,000
II. Program direction - OE	---	80,000	80,000	80,000
TOTAL, HYDROPOWER	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE				
I. Electric energy systems				
A. Electric field effects research				
Operating expenses	2,928,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	3,500,000
B. Reliability research				
Operating expenses	2,434,000	1,572,000	1,572,000	1,572,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. System and materials research				
Operating expenses	11,831,000	21,761,000	21,761,000	21,761,000
Capital equipment	---	900,000	900,000	900,000
Subtotal, System and materials research	11,831,000	22,661,000	22,661,000	22,661,000
D. Program direction - OE	490,000	614,000	614,000	614,000
Subtotal, Electric energy systems	17,683,000	27,347,000	27,347,000	28,347,000
II. Energy Storage Systems				
A. Battery storage				
Operating expenses	10,157,000	11,189,000	12,189,000	9,189,000
Capital equipment	27,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Subtotal, Battery storage	10,184,000	11,489,000	12,489,000	9,489,000
B. Thermal and chemical storage				
Operating expenses	1,708,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	3,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Program direction - OE	399,000	417,000	417,000	417,000
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	12,291,000	12,906,000	13,906,000	12,906,000
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE	29,974,000	40,253,000	41,253,000	41,253,000
(Operating expenses)	(29,947,000)	(39,053,000)	(40,053,000)	(40,053,000)
(Capital equipment)	(27,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)
NUCLEAR				
I. Nuclear energy R & D				
A. Light water reactor				
Operating expenses	24,423,000	41,500,000	31,500,000	41,500,000
B. Advanced reactor R & D				
Operating expenses	56,784,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	70,000,000
Capital equipment	1,972,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Advanced reactor R & D	58,756,000	47,000,000	47,000,000	72,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Space & defense power systems				
Operating expenses	21,623,000	38,040,000	38,040,000	22,040,000
Capital equipment	2,426,000	2,160,000	2,160,000	2,160,000
Construction:				
86-N-105 SP-100 fac. mods - HEDL	7,298,000	14,300,000	14,300,000	7,300,000
Subtotal, Space & defense power systems	31,347,000	54,500,000	54,500,000	31,500,000
D. Advanced nuclear systems				
Operating expenses	29,777,000	55,500,000	55,500,000	55,500,000
Capital equipment	3,944,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
Construction:				
89-N-111 RPSF	15,319,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems	49,040,000	75,500,000	75,500,000	75,500,000
E. Facilities				
Operating expenses	161,191,000	131,078,000	83,078,000	91,078,000
Capital equipment	4,043,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
Construction:				
91-E-201 Modification to reactors	---	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
GPN-102 GPP	3,648,000	3,012,000	3,012,000	3,012,000
90-N-202 Mod to reactors	5,177,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-N-115 Fire suf. imp., ANL	1,726,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
Subtotal, Construction	10,551,000	4,912,000	4,912,000	4,912,000
Subtotal, Facilities	175,785,000	140,490,000	92,490,000	100,490,000
F. Program direction - OE	8,677,000	8,800,000	8,800,000	8,800,000
Subtotal, Nuclear energy R & D	348,028,000	367,790,000	309,790,000	329,790,000
(Operating expenses)	(302,475,000)	(319,918,000)	(261,918,000)	(288,918,000)
(Capital equipment)	(12,385,000)	(12,860,000)	(12,860,000)	(12,860,000)
(Construction)	(33,168,000)	(35,012,000)	(35,012,000)	(28,012,000)
II. Remedial actions and waste technology				
A. Formerly utilized sites				
Operating expenses	14,544,000	---	---	---
Capital equipment	99,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Formerly utilized sites	14,643,000	---	---	---
B. Uranium program mill tailings				
Operating expenses	92,783,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	986,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Uranium program mill tailings	93,769,000	---	---	---
C. Surplus facilities				
Operating expenses	28,791,000	---	---	---
Capital equipment	493,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Surplus facilities	29,284,000	---	---	---
D. West valley				
Operating expenses	87,387,000	---	---	---
E. Low level waste				
Operating expenses	4,815,000	---	---	---
F. Waste technology and by-products				
Operating expenses	532,000	---	---	---
G. Program direction - OE	2,564,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Remedial actions and waste technology	232,994,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Civilian waste R & D				
A. Spent fuel storage R & D				
Operating expenses	780,000	590,000	3,590,000	590,000
B. Program direction	197,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
Subtotal, Civilian waste R & D	977,000	700,000	3,700,000	700,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR	581,999,000	368,490,000	313,490,000	330,490,000
(Operating expenses)	(534,868,000)	(320,618,000)	(265,618,000)	(289,618,000)
(Capital equipment)	(13,963,000)	(12,860,000)	(12,860,000)	(12,860,000)
(Construction)	(33,168,000)	(35,012,000)	(35,012,000)	(28,012,000)
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR SAFETY				
I. Nuclear Safety				
Operating expenses	---	8,000,000	---	8,000,000
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH				
I. Environment, safety and health				
Operating expenses	108,904,000	104,879,000	95,879,000	104,879,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	3,057,000	1,542,000	1,542,000	1,542,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	111,961,000	106,421,000	97,421,000	106,421,000
LIQUIFIED GASEOUS SPILL TEST FACILITY				
I. Spill test facility				
Operating expenses	1,025,000	1,085,000	1,085,000	1,085,000
BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH				
I. Biological and environmental research				
Operating expenses	294,365,000	317,888,000	350,488,000	375,488,000
Capital equipment	11,635,000	11,621,000	11,621,000	11,621,000
Construction:				
GP-E-120 General plant projects	3,451,000	3,485,000	3,485,000	3,485,000
Subtotal, Construction	3,451,000	3,485,000	3,485,000	3,485,000
II. Program direction	4,536,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
TOTAL, BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	313,987,000	338,794,000	371,394,000	396,394,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)..................................	(298,901,000)	(323,688,000)	(356,288,000)	(381,288,000)
(Capital equipment).................................	(11,635,000)	(11,621,000)	(11,621,000)	(11,621,000)
(Construction).......................................	(3,451,000)	(3,485,000)	(3,485,000)	(3,485,000)
FUSION				
I. Magnetic fusion				
A. Confinement systems............................	323,018,000	163,050,000	163,050,000	163,050,000
B. Development and technology......................	---	48,060,000	48,060,000	48,060,000
C. Applied plasma physics..........................	---	70,880,000	70,880,000	70,880,000
D. Planning and projects...........................	---	4,250,000	4,250,000	4,250,000
E. Program direction - OE..........................	---	5,650,000	5,650,000	5,650,000
F. Capital equipment...............................	---	14,310,000	14,310,000	14,310,000
G. Construction				
GPP-900 General plant projects..................	---	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-R-800 Confinement physics res facility.......	---	11,100,000	11,100,000	11,100,000
Subtotal, Construction............................	---	19,100,000	19,100,000	19,100,000
TOTAL, FUSION.....................................	323,018,000	325,300,000	325,300,000	325,300,000
(Operating expenses)..............................	(323,018,000)	(291,890,000)	(291,890,000)	(291,890,000)
(Capital equipment)...............................	---	(14,310,000)	(14,310,000)	(14,310,000)
(Construction).....................................	---	(19,100,000)	(19,100,000)	(19,100,000)
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS				
I. Basic energy sciences				
A. Materials sciences.............................	203,257,000	221,954,000	266,547,000	276,547,000
B. Chemical sciences..............................	144,107,000	150,500,000	150,500,000	158,500,000
C. Applied mathematical sciences..................	43,705,000	47,975,000	47,975,000	52,975,000
D. Engineering and geosciences....................	33,204,000	32,500,000	32,500,000	34,500,000
E. Advanced energy projects.......................	14,591,000	24,000,000	24,000,000	25,000,000
F. Energy biosciences.............................	20,647,000	20,200,000	20,200,000	22,200,000
G. Program direction - OE.........................	5,374,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
H. Capital equipment	37,061,000	37,019,000	37,019,000	37,019,000
I. Construction				
91-E-314 AID	---	6,965,000	6,965,000	6,965,000
GPE-400 General plant projects	5,510,000	3,069,000	3,069,000	3,069,000
90-R-401 AIP	4,536,000	---	---	---
90-R-402 Partial decon. and protective storage of ANL CP-5 research reactor	986,000	---	---	---
89-R-402 6-7 GeV Syn. Radiation Source	39,440,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
88-R-403 3 GeV Spear Injector, SSRL	4,437,000	---	---	---
87-R-406 1-2 GeV Synch Rad Sc, LBL	25,636,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	80,545,000	108,034,000	108,034,000	108,034,000
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences	582,491,000	648,682,000	693,275,000	721,275,000
(Operating expenses)	(464,885,000)	(503,629,000)	(548,222,000)	(576,222,000)
(Capital equipment)	(37,061,000)	(37,019,000)	(37,019,000)	(37,019,000)
(Construction)	(80,545,000)	(108,034,000)	(108,034,000)	(108,034,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Energy oversight, research analy. and Univ support				
A. Energy research analysis - OE	3,800,000	3,683,000	3,683,000	3,683,000
B. University research support - OE				
Operating expenses:				
1. University reactor fuel assistance	3,071,000	2,230,000	7,230,000	2,230,000
2. Laboratory Coop Science Education Ctrs	16,903,000	23,230,000	29,230,000	33,230,000
3. University program	2,722,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
4. R & D laboratory tech transfer	2,219,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Subtotal, University research support	24,915,000	29,760,000	40,760,000	39,760,000
C. Advisory and oversight - OE	3,326,000	4,250,000	4,250,000	4,250,000
D. University research instrumentation	4,930,000	4,924,000	4,924,000	4,924,000
Subtotal, Energy oversight, res analy, and Univ sup	36,971,000	42,617,000	53,617,000	52,617,000
III. Multiprogram energy laboratories - facility sup				
A. Multiprogram general purpose facilities				
Construction:				
91-E-300 Building 90 Science Rehab, LBL	---	3,700,000	---	3,700,000
90-R-100 Trans. Fac. Replacement, ANL	345,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-R-121 Rehab fire, water, pumping and storage systems, ANL........................	148,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
90-R-107 Boiler Replacement, BNL............	319,000	3,201,000	3,196,000	3,201,000
90-R-108 Ctrl. Shops Alteration & Add., BNL.	306,000	1,374,000	1,370,000	1,374,000
90-R-109 Building Addition, BNL.............	1,676,000	24,000	---	24,000
90-R-110 Instrumentation Sup. Lab. Rehab, LB	197,000	---	1,800,000	---
90-R-111 Original Labsite Substation, LBL...	247,000	---	2,400,000	---
90-R-112 Measurements and Controls Support Facility, ORNL......................	884,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
90-R-113 Elec. Syst. Upgrade, ORNL..........	843,000	1,457,000	1,445,000	1,457,000
90-R-115 Laboratory & Sanitary Sewer Collection System Rehab., ANL..............	493,000	---	---	---
90-R-116 Hazardous Waste Management Projects, BNL..............................	158,000	---	---	---
90-R-117 Slope/Seismic Stabilization, LBL...	493,000	2,415,000	2,200,000	2,415,000
90-R-118 Fire Protection Upgrade, ORNL......	1,321,000	1,979,000	1,960,000	1,979,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-R-119 Sanitary Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements, ANL	493,000	---	---	---
89-R-102 Fire Protection III, BNL	2,322,000	33,000	---	33,000
89-R-108 roads and parking rehab., ORNL	858,000	12,000	---	12,000
89-R-111 Building utilities, PNL	2,138,000	---	---	---
89-R-112 Replace PCB Transformers, ANL	1,361,000	7,000	---	7,000
89-R-113 Environmental Upgrades, BNL	3,216,000	---	---	---
88-R-805 Environmental improvements, BNL	1,468,000	18,000	---	18,000
88-R-806 Environmental health & safety project, LBL	4,769,000	1,574,000	1,512,000	1,574,000
88-R-807 Electrical system rehab, ANL	2,662,000	898,000	860,000	898,000
88-R-812 Hazardous waste handling fac, LBL	1,331,000	---	---	---
87-R-753 Rehabilitate Laboratory Space (Building 200), ANL	2,574,000	1,537,000	1,500,000	1,537,000
87-R-756 Waterline Replacement, ANL	529,000	8,000	---	8,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)...	393,000	6,000	---	6,000
Subtotal, Multiprogram general purpose facilities	31,544,000	23,743,000	23,743,000	23,743,000
B. Environmental compliance				
Operating expenses..........................	8,874,000	---	---	---
Construction:				
90-R-770 GPP................................	986,000	---	---	---
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade, ORNL..............	10,353,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction........................	11,339,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Environmental compliance...............	20,213,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy laboratories - fac sup..	51,757,000	23,743,000	23,743,000	23,743,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(8,874,000)	---	---	---
(Construction)................................	(42,883,000)	(23,743,000)	(23,743,000)	(23,743,000)
TOTAL, SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS.....	671,219,000	715,042,000	770,635,000	797,635,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(510,730,000)	(546,246,000)	(601,839,000)	(628,839,000)
(Capital equipment)	(37,061,000)	(37,019,000)	(37,019,000)	(37,019,000)
(Construction)	(123,428,000)	(131,777,000)	(131,777,000)	(131,777,000)
POLICY AND MANAGEMENT				
I. Policy and management				
A. Policy and management - ER	665,000	850,000	850,000	850,000
B. Policy and management - NE	2,169,000	32,921,000	32,921,000	32,921,000
C. Policy and management - CE	1,541,000	1,668,000	1,668,000	1,668,000
TOTAL, POLICY AND MANAGEMENT	4,375,000	35,439,000	35,439,000	35,439,000
ENERGY APPLICATIONS				
I. Technical information management program				
Operating expenses	13,656,000	14,100,000	25,100,000	14,100,000
Capital equipment	937,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
Construction	197,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Technical information management program	14,790,000	15,000,000	26,000,000	15,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. In-house energy management				
Operating expenses................................	1,992,000	3,540,000	3,540,000	3,540,000
Construction:				
90-A-601 Modifications for energy mgmt..........	15,244,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
90-A-602 Convert Boiler No. 4 (ANL).............	2,238,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction............................	17,482,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
Subtotal, In-house energy management.................	19,474,000	20,540,000	20,540,000	20,540,000
III. Strategic facilities utilization program				
Operating expenses...............................	1,949,000	---	---	---
Construction:				
GP-A-101 Excess facilities - GPP............	195,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Strategic facilities utilization program....	2,144,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
TOTAL, ENERGY APPLICATIONS............................	36,408,000	38,540,000	49,540,000	38,540,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT (NON-DEFENSE)				
I. Corrective activities				
A. Nuclear energy				
Operating expenses	---	---	809,000	809,000
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General plant project	---	---	442,000	442,000
91-E-203 SCTI waste water disposal system	---	---	2,861,000	2,861,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	3,303,000	3,303,000
Subtotal, Nuclear energy	---	---	4,112,000	4,112,000
B. Energy research				
Operating expenses	---	---	2,756,000	2,756,000
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General plant proj, various locations	---	---	5,080,000	5,080,000
91-E-307 800 Area landfill leachate (ANL)	---	---	250,000	250,000
91-E-304 Sanit. wastewater treatment upgrade	---	---	400,000	400,000
90-R-115 Laboratory and sanitary sewer collection system rehab (ANL)	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-R-116 Hazardous waste mgmt proj (BNL)......	---	---	2,240,000	2,240,000
90-R-119 Sanitary wastewater treatment plant improvements (ANL)......................	---	---	3,310,000	3,310,000
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade (ORNL)...............	---	---	7,913,000	7,913,000
Subtotal, Construction.........................	---	---	20,193,000	20,193,000
Subtotal, Energy research.........................	---	---	22,949,000	22,949,000
Subtotal, Corrective activities......................	---	---	27,061,000	27,061,000
(Operating expenses).................................	---	---	(3,565,000)	(3,565,000)
(Construction).................................	---	---	(23,496,000)	(23,496,000)
II. Environmental restoration				
Operating expenses:				
1. Facilities and sites.........................	---	---	105,105,000	80,105,000
2. Formerly utilized sites, remedial action projects...................................	---	---	36,200,000	36,200,000
3. Uranium program mill tailings, remedial action projects............................	---	---	124,500,000	124,500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
4. Uranium mill tailings, groundwater restoration project	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Operating expenses	---	---	266,805,000	241,805,000
Construction:				
90-R-402 Storage of the ANL CP-5 reactor	---	---	4,400,000	4,400,000
89-R-113 Environmental upgrades, BNL	---	---	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	7,400,000	7,400,000
Subtotal, Environmental restoration	---	---	274,205,000	249,205,000
(Operating expenses)	---	---	(266,805,000)	(241,805,000)
(Construction)	---	---	(7,400,000)	(7,400,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Waste management				
Operating expenses:				
1. Waste operations	---	---	135,290,000	110,290,000
2. West valley	---	---	90,000,000	90,000,000
3. Low level waste	---	---	11,500,000	11,500,000
Subtotal, Operating expenses	---	---	236,790,000	211,790,000
Capital equipment	---	---	786,000	786,000
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General plant projects	---	---	3,567,000	3,567,000
91-E-322 Building compliance	---	---	1,800,000	1,800,000
91-E-305 Waste minimization fac. upgrade, BNL	---	---	500,000	500,000
91-E-306 Haz waste treatment fac, PNL	---	---	970,000	970,000
89-R-111 Building utilities, PNL	---	---	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	7,037,000	7,037,000
Subtotal, Waste management	---	---	244,613,000	219,613,000
(Operating expenses)	---	---	(236,790,000)	(211,790,000)
(Capital equipment)	---	---	(786,000)	(786,000)
(Construction)	---	---	(7,037,000)	(7,037,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Technology development				
Operating expenses	---	---	500,000	500,000
Construction:				
91-EM-100 Environmental and molecular science laboratory at Richland	---	---	5,200,000	5,200,000
Subtotal, Technology development	---	---	5,700,000	5,700,000
V. Program direction	---	---	24,106,000	24,106,000
Program slippage	---	---	-12,000,000	-12,000,000
TOTAL, ENVIRON RESTOR AND WASTE MGMT (NON-DEFENSE)	---	---	563,685,000	513,685,000
(Operating expenses)	---	---	(519,766,000)	(469,766,000)
(Capital equipment)	---	---	(786,000)	(786,000)
(Construction)	---	---	(43,133,000)	(43,133,000)
General reduction	---	---	-20,000,000	---
Use of prior year balances	---	-6,900,000	---	-6,900,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,184,449,000	2,105,337,000	2,703,272,000	2,745,615,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,936,488,000)	(1,808,706,000)	(2,362,722,000)	(2,412,065,000)
(Capital equipment)	(69,867,000)	(82,467,000)	(83,253,000)	(83,253,000)
(Construction)	(178,094,000)	(214,164,000)	(257,297,000)	(250,297,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT				
I. Corrective activities				
A. Environmental management				
Operating expenses	---	43,846,000	---	---
Capital equipment	---	1,980,000	---	---
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General Plant Project	---	3,720,000	---	---
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance	---	6,800,000	---	---
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	---	22,601,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	---	33,121,000	---	---
Subtotal, Environmental management	---	78,947,000	---	---
B. Defense programs				
Operating expenses	---	17,808,000	---	---
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General plant projects	---	5,259,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-D-103 Environment, safety and health improvements, various locations	---	4,200,000	---	---
90-D-125 Steam plant ash disposal facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	6,000,000	---	---
89-D-126 Environmental, safety, & health upgrade, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	---	1,723,000	---	---
88-D-102 Sanitary wastewaters systems consolidated, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	---	3,500,000	---	---
89-D-142 Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River, SC	---	44,600,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	---	65,282,000	---	---
Subtotal, Defense programs	---	83,090,000	---	---
C. Nuclear energy				
Operating expenses	---	809,000	---	---
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General Plant Project	---	442,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
91-E-203 SCTI waste water disposal system.....	---	2,861,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction..........................	---	3,303,000	---	---
Subtotal, Nuclear energy..........................	---	4,112,000	---	---
D. Energy research				
Operating expenses..............................	---	2,756,000	---	---
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General plant projects, various locations............................	---	5,080,000	---	---
91-E-307 800 Area landfill leachate (ANL).....	---	250,000	---	---
91-E-304 San wastewater Trmt Upg..............	---	400,000	---	---
90-R-115 Laboratory and sanitary sewer collection system rehab., ANL.................	---	1,000,000	---	---
90-R-116 Hazardous waste management projects, BNL................................	---	2,240,000	---	---
90-R-119 Sanitary wastewater treatment plant improvements, ANL.......................	---	3,310,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade, ORNL	---	7,913,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	---	20,193,000	---	---
Subtotal, Energy research	---	22,949,000	---	---
Subtotal, Corrective activities	---	189,098,000	---	---
(Operating expenses)	---	(65,219,000)	---	---
(Capital equipment)	---	(1,980,000)	---	---
(Construction)	---	(121,899,000)	---	---
II. Environmental restoration				
Operating expenses:				
1. Facilities and sites	---	719,820,000	---	---
2. Formerly utilized sites, remedial action projects	---	36,200,000	---	---
3. Uranium program mill tailings, remedial action projects	---	124,500,000	---	---
4. Uranium mill tailings, groundwater restoration project	---	1,000,000	---	---
Subtotal, Operating expenses	---	881,520,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
90-R-402 Storage of the ANL CP-5 reactor........	---	4,400,000	---	---
89-R-113 Environmental upgrades, BNL............	---	3,000,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction..........................	---	7,400,000	---	---
Subtotal, Environmental restoration..................	---	888,920,000	---	---
(Operating expenses)..................................	---	(881,520,000)	---	---
(Construction).......................................	---	(7,400,000)	---	---
III. Waste management				
Operating expenses:				
1. Waste operations..........................	---	1,164,217,000	---	---
2. West valley................................	---	90,000,000	---	---
3. Low level waste............................	---	11,500,000	---	---
4. Waste technology and by-products............	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Operating expenses.....................	---	1,265,717,000	---	---
Capital equipment................................	---	82,805,000	---	---
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General plant projects................	---	44,721,000	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
91-D-173 Hazardous low-level waste processing tanks, Savannah River Site, SC......	---	5,800,000	---	---
91-D-172 High-level waste tank farm upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing plant, INEL, ID..................................	---	13,000,000	---	---
91-D-171 Waste receiving and processing facility, module 1, Richland, WA...............	---	2,700,000	---	---
90-D-171 Laboratory ventilation and electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA..................	---	4,100,000	---	---
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA....................................	---	4,000,000	---	---
90-D-173 B-plant canyon crane replacement, Richland, WA	---	4,300,000	---	---
90-D-174 Decontamination laundry facility, Richland, WA	---	9,900,000	---	---
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance-I, Richland, WA	---	2,640,000	---	---
90-D-176 Transuranic (TRU) waste facility, Savannah River, SC	---	15,300,000	---	---

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

GROSS APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations, 1990	$1,412,437,000
Budget estimate, 1991	1,340,018,000
House allowance	1,406,018,000
Committee recommendation	1,340,018,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1990	–$1,500,900,000
Budget estimate, 1991	–1,450,400,000
House allowance	–1,530,000,000
Committee recommendation	–1,450,400,000

The appropriation recommended for uranium supply and enrichment activities provides for uranium enrichment production, uranium atomic vapor laser isotope separation [U-AVLIS] research and development, and related support activities. In this account, revenues received through the sale of enrichment services are used to offset costs incurred by the Department in providing these services. The total budget request for fiscal year 1991 is $1,340,018,000. Revenues are estimated in the budget request of $1,450,400,000 which are to be used to offset the requested fiscal year 1991 appropriation.

The budget proposed by the administration assumes the enactment of legislation to create a U.S. Uranium Enrichment Corporation, a wholly owned Government Corporation. The Corporation would be responsible for maintaining a domestic source of enrichment services.

The proposed authorizing legislation has passed the Senate but no action has been taken by the House. The Committee has recommended an appropriation, offset by revenues, to the Department of Energy in the same manner as in previous years. The Committee reiterates its position that any proposal on the part of the Department to transfer any part or all of the enrichment enterprise to another entity for the purpose of providing enrichment services requires the prior enactment of enabling legislation.

Gaseous diffusion operations and support.—The budget request for this activity is $1,089,600,000. The budget proposes the production of approximately 6 million separative work units [SWU] in fiscal year 1991.

Uranium atomic vapor laser isotope separation [U-AVLIS].—The budget request for this activity is $154,500,000, of which $146,500,000 is for operating expenses and $8,000,000 is for capital equipment and construction.

The Committee is concerned that the necessary actions are not being taken on a timely basis to assure that it will be possible to deploy U-AVLIS technology at the earliest practicable date following technical demonstration of plant scale equipment. The Committee has strongly supported the development of U-AVLIS technology to provide this country with a low cost, reliable source of uranium enrichment services well into the next century to help retain the U.S. competitive advantage and leadership in uranium enrichment. This is necessary because the existing gaseous diffusion plant

[GDP] complex is approaching the end of useful life. There is the prospect of very large and continually increasing expenditures being required for environmental, safety, and health upgrades to bring the GDP facilities into compliance with modern standards to support continued operations.

The U-AVLIS plan provided to the Congress in January 1990 focuses on two major events in 1992, technology demonstration with plant scale equipment and a decision concerning future plant deployment. However, additional actions are needed immediately to provide greater assurance that a U-AVLIS plant can be designed, constructed, and placed in operation at the earliest practicable date following a deployment decision. Actions which are needed on a priority basis include:

—A preferred site for a U-AVLIS plant should be selected promptly so that critical design work can proceed to enable plant deployment at the earliest practicable date. Alternate sites should be evaluated against the preferred site as part of the environmental review process. Sites considered for the preferred site should include advantageous green field sites as well as existing DOE sites.

—A plan should be prepared on a priority basis establishing the steps necessary to minimize the schedule for plant deployment. Particular care should be given to establishing a process for successfully meeting regulatory requirements to avoid delays.

—An industrial entity should be selected as soon as practicable to take prime responsibility for managing and integrating all deployment activities from conceptual design through delivery of an operating plant.

—A dedicated U-AVLIS project organization should be established within the DOE which is independent from the current uranium enrichment organization so that the focus on this high priority effort is not diluted by the many demands arising daily from ongoing operations.

Implementation of these priority actions will provide increased assurance that the U-AVLIS program will be adequately prepared to achieve plant operations at the earliest practicable time following a decision to deploy U-AVLIS.

Revenues.—In the Fiscal Year 1987 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Congress reserved to itself the authority to determine the level of any unrecouped costs that must be returned to the Treasury in future legislation. To date, the Congress has not made such a determination. Accordingly, the recommended appropriation does not approve debt repayment and employs appropriation language which applies estimated fiscal year 1991 revenues to offset the recommended appropriations. Any revenues collected in fiscal year 1991 in excess of the amount needed to fully offset appropriations shall remain in the uranium enrichment account until transferred or otherwise redirected in legislation.

The administration has proposed legislation in the appropriation language that would allow the Department of Energy to purchase enrichment services at prices below the Department's cost of production and establish a new decontamination and decommissioning fund. The Committee recommendation does not include the proposed legislation and urges that these provisions be considered during the deliberation on the proposed legislation establishing a U.S. Uranium Enrichment Corporation.

The following table shows the Committee's recommendation by program.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste treatment and storage facility, ID.............	---	26,000,000	---	---
90-D-178 TSA retrieval containment building, ID....................................	---	11,100,000	---	---
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance, Richland, WA	---	35,660,000	---	---
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	---	3,400,000	---	---
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	---	11,330,000	---	---
89-D-175 Hazardous waste/mixed waste disposal facility, Savannah River, SC	---	7,600,000	---	---
88-D-173 Hanford waste vitrification plant (HWVP), Richland, WA...........................	---	75,500,000	---	---
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	---	4,985,000	---	---
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	---	5,000,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
91-D-125 Environment, safety and health upgrades, Phase III, Mound Facility Miamisburg, OH	---	284,000	---	---
89-D-122 Production waste storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	5,500,000	---	---
89-D-141 M-Area waste disposal, Savannah River, SC	---	7,500,000	---	---
91-E-322 Building compliance	---	1,800,000	---	---
91-E-305 Waste minimization fac. upgrade, BNL	---	500,000	---	---
91-E-306 Haz waste treatment fac, PNL	---	970,000	---	---
89-R-111 Building utilities, PNL	---	200,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	---	303,790,000	---	---
Subtotal, Waste management	---	1,652,312,000	---	---
(Operating expenses)	---	(1,265,717,000)	---	---
(Capital equipment)	---	(82,805,000)	---	---
(Construction)	---	(303,790,000)	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Technology development				
Operating expenses	---	183,980,000	---	---
Capital equipment	---	16,820,000	---	---
Construction:				
91-EM-100 Environmental and molecular science laboratory at Richland	---	5,200,000	---	---
Subtotal, Technology development	---	206,000,000	---	---
V. Program direction	---	24,106,000	---	---
Subtotal, Environmental restoration and waste mgmt	---	2,960,436,000	---	---
Program slippage due to delays in permitting	---	-142,000,000	---	---
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT	---	2,818,436,000	---	---
(Operating expenses)	---	(2,278,542,000)	---	---
(Capital equipment)	---	(101,605,000)	---	---
(Construction)	---	(438,289,000)	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
URANIUM ENRICHMENT				
I. Uranium enrichment activities				
A. Gaseous diffusion operations and support				
Operating expenses............................	1,168,937,000	1,029,200,000	1,077,700,000	1,029,200,000
Capital equipment.............................	9,870,000	7,800,000	15,700,000	7,800,000
Construction:				
91-U-200 Replace capacitors, GDP, Paducah.....	---	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
91-U-201 Refurbish int. purge fac., GDP, Ports	---	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
91-U-207 Roof upgrading, GDP, Portsmouth......	---	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
91-U-208 S & S upgrading, GDP, Portsmouth.....	---	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
91-U-209 Proc inv ctrl sys Phase II, GDP, Port	---	---	3,800,000	---
90-N-501 Cooling tower mods...................	296,000	8,700,000	8,700,000	8,700,000
GP-N-501 GPP..................................	---	8,800,000	12,600,000	8,800,000
GP-N-502 General plant projects...............	8,192,000	---	---	---
89-N-501 UF6 cylinders........................	5,823,000	10,100,000	10,100,000	10,100,000
88-N-502 Process inventory control system, Pad	24,676,000	6,300,000	8,300,000	6,300,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1990	$737,566,000
Budget estimate, 1991	829,634,000
House allowance	829,634,000
Committee recommendation	829,634,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1990	$361,263,000
Budget estimate, 1991	444,098,000
House allowance	444,098,000
Committee recommendation	444,098,000

The general science programs are concerned with basic research to discover and understand the fundamental constituents of matter and energy and the basic forces in nature. Understanding of the laws of nature and the basic components from which matter and energy in all their varied forms are composed, forms the foundation upon which all of modern science and technology rests. Deeper understanding correspondingly contributes, sometimes in spectacular ways, to all of the scientific disciplines and to our Nation's technological base.

The general science program is organized into interrelated scientific programs, high-energy physics, and nuclear physics. While these programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near term or midterm, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization and on other aspects of our society.

The Committee recommends $1,273,732,000 for general science and research activities, which is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

The Committee recommends $621,187,000 for high-energy physics.

Nuclear physics.—The recommendation includes $330,729,000 for nuclear physics activities.

For the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility [CEBAF] in Newport, VA, the Committee recommends $65,000,000 for fiscal year 1991. Continuing to stretch out construction of this project is not in the interest of the taxpayers nor the nuclear physics program.

The CEBAF will have unique capabilities to provide continuous beams of electrons simultaneously to three independent experimental areas. The initial research proposals have been developed by the national user community and selected after review by the CEBAF Program Advisory Committee. The plan for the basic experimental equipment required to accomplish CEBAF's research programs has been reviewed and endorsed by the Department of Energy, and the Nuclear Science Advisory Committee.

It is the Committee's understanding that it is the Department of Energy's objective to bring the basic complement of experimental equipment for CEBAF's three experimental areas into operation during 1994 and 1995. The Committee supports this Department of Energy objective.

The full budget request of $15,000,000 to initiate construction of the relativistic heavy ion collider [RHIC] is approved.

Superconducting Super Collider.—The Committee recommends $317,866,000 for the Superconducting Super Collider [SSC] the same as the budget request and House allowance.

The Committee recognizes the importance of the Super Collider to science and our Nation. It holds great potential for exploring the structure of matter and stimulating new technology.

In order to complete the SSC based on the present plan, non-Federal participation will be necessary. The State of Texas has offered significant financial contributions toward the development, construction, and operation of the project.

In action on last year's appropriation bill, the Committee recommended certain provisions and action in connection with foreign participation and involvement with the Superconducting Super Collider project. However, in recognition of the international character of high energy physics research and the fact that the Superconducting Super Collider will be used by scientists from many nations, the Secretary of Energy is encouraged to continue with efforts seeking significant foreign investment in the construction of the project. At the same time, it is the continued consensus of the Committee that the SSC should proceed whether foreign participation is forthcoming or not. Simply stated, if the SSC is a high-priority project and important for this Nation, which the Committee believes it is, then we should be prepared to proceed. The Committee believes that the benefits to be gained by magnet industrialization, especially manufacturing technology in the U.S. industry outweigh the budgetary requirements that appear to require foreign participation. Additionally, the funds made available under this appropriation act to the Department of Energy for the project shall be used to assure that U.S. industrial participants and contractors are given the maximum opportunity to participate in the SSC project in order that U.S. industry receives benefits commensurate with the U.S. investment from the new technologies developed for the project especially magnet manufacturing technologies.

It is the Committee's intent that the Secretary of Energy comply with all existing laws to ensure that the Federal funding for the development, construction, and operation of the SSC be made available to the extent practicable to business concerns or other organizations owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (within the meaning of section 8(a) (5) and (6)), including historically black colleges and universities and minority educational institutions.

The following tabulation shows the Committee recommendation for each program and activity:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-N-502 Cooling tower upgrade, GDP, Paducah..	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
82-N-413 Improved UF6 containment............	7,501,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Subtotal, Construction.........................	46,488,000	52,600,000	62,200,000	52,600,000
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion operations and support.	1,225,295,000	1,089,600,000	1,155,600,000	1,089,600,000
B. Atomic vapor laser isotope separation				
Operating expenses............................	123,280,000	146,500,000	146,500,000	146,500,000
Capital equipment.............................	7,995,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000
Construction:				
GP-N-600 General plant projects...............	988,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Subtotal, Atomic vapor laser isotope separation....	132,263,000	154,500,000	154,500,000	154,500,000
C. Corrective action - environment				
Operating expenses............................	---	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000
Construction:				
91-U-206 Reduction of PCB contamination.......	---	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
Subtotal, Corrective action - environment.........	---	9,250,000	9,250,000	9,250,000
D. Environmental restoration				
Operating expenses............................	49,845,000	67,419,000	67,419,000	67,419,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Waste management				
Operating expenses	---	10,304,000	10,304,000	10,304,000
Capital equipment	---	2,945,000	2,945,000	2,945,000
Construction:				
GP-N-210 General plant projects	---	700,000	700,000	700,000
Subtotal, Waste management	---	13,949,000	13,949,000	13,949,000
F. Program direction - OE	5,034,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities	1,412,437,000	1,340,018,000	1,406,018,000	1,340,018,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,347,096,000)	(1,262,473,000)	(1,310,973,000)	(1,262,473,000)
(Capital equipment)	(17,865,000)	(16,345,000)	(24,245,000)	(16,345,000)
(Construction)	(47,476,000)	(61,200,000)	(70,800,000)	(61,200,000)
Revenues	-1,500,900,000	-1,450,400,000	-1,530,500,000	-1,450,400,000
TOTAL URANIUM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	-88,463,000	-110,382,000	-124,482,000	-110,382,000
(Operating expenses)	(-153,804,000)	(-187,927,000)	(-219,527,000)	(-187,927,000)
(Capital equipment)	(17,865,000)	(16,345,000)	(24,245,000)	(16,345,000)
(Construction)	(47,476,000)	(61,200,000)	(70,800,000)	(61,200,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH				
I. High energy physics				
A. Physics research				
Operating expenses	131,208,000	140,250,000	140,250,000	140,250,000
B. Facility operations				
Operating expenses	263,361,000	278,715,000	278,715,000	278,715,000
Capital equipment	80,063,000	83,730,000	83,730,000	83,730,000
Construction:				
91-G-304 AIP	---	14,535,000	18,535,000	14,535,000
90-R-101 AIP	13,838,000	---	---	---
90-R-104 Fermilab Linac Upgrade Project	4,634,000	12,000,000	8,000,000	12,000,000
GP-E-103 General plant projects, various locations	12,670,000	12,317,000	12,317,000	12,317,000
86-R-105 AGS Accumulator/Booster	4,915,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	36,057,000	38,852,000	38,852,000	38,852,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	379,481,000	401,297,000	401,297,000	401,297,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. High energy technology				
Operating expenses..............................	71,722,000	75,190,000	75,190,000	75,190,000
D. Other capital equipment - CE....................	4,240,000	4,450,000	4,450,000	4,450,000
Subtotal, High energy physics........................	586,651,000	621,187,000	621,187,000	621,187,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(466,291,000)	(494,155,000)	(494,155,000)	(494,155,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	(84,303,000)	(88,180,000)	(88,180,000)	(88,180,000)
(Construction)................................	(36,057,000)	(38,852,000)	(38,852,000)	(38,852,000)
II. Nuclear physics				
A. Medium energy physics				
Operating expenses............................	92,388,000	101,000,000	101,000,000	101,000,000
B. Heavy ion physics				
Operating expenses............................	68,455,000	72,929,000	72,929,000	72,929,000
C. Low energy physics				
Operating expenses............................	26,326,000	28,100,000	28,100,000	28,100,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Nuclear theory				
Operating expenses	12,226,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000
E. Capital equipment	18,241,000	25,100,000	25,100,000	25,100,000
F. Construction:				
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider	---	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
91-G-301 AIP	---	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
90-R-AIP	4,536,000	---	---	---
GP-E-300 General plant projects, various locations	4,338,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
87-R-203 Continuous electron beam accelerator facility, Newport News, VA	62,611,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	71,485,000	88,500,000	88,500,000	88,500,000
G. Other capital equipment - CE	1,479,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	290,600,000	330,729,000	330,729,000	330,729,000

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriations, 1990	$295,156,000
Budget estimate, 1991	292,833,000
House allowance	292,833,000
Committee recommendation	292,833,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987 provide for the development, construction, and operation of a repository for the disposal of high-level nuclear waste and spent fuel. The law also establishes the nuclear waste disposal fund to finance these activities through the collection of fees from the owners and generators of the waste. In fiscal year 1991, the fund will generate revenues of $775,000,000 derived from fees and interest income.

The goal of the nuclear waste disposal fund program is to construct, license, and operate a waste management system for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste from commercial and atomic energy defense activities in a manner that is safe and environmentally acceptable and in conformance with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987. Yucca Mountain, NV, has been designated as the site for detailed site characterization activities. If the Nevada site is found suitable after completion of site characterization, the site will be recommended for development as a repository and a license application will be submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Upon completion of the Commission's review of the license application, if the Commission finds reasonable assurance that the public health and safety will be protected, the Department of Energy would be authorized to construct a repository at the Yucca Mountain site.

The overall budget request for this activity is $292,833,000, including $10,000,000 for analysis of a monitored retrievable storage site. The Committee recommendation is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

The Committee is aware of ongoing initiatives of the Secretary of Energy and the Director of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management to restructure and streamline the nuclear waste program, to eliminate duplicative or unnecessary contractual arrangements, and to obtain access to Yucca Mountain to carry out site characterization activities. The Committee supports these efforts. The Committee remains concerned, however, about the State of Nevada's continued refusal to issue certain environmental permits necessary for the conduct of site characterization. Further, the Committee is concerned about the State of Nevada's apparent resolve to use every possible legal means to frustrate and obstruct the Department's ability to carry out the nuclear waste program. In that regard, the Committee urges the Department to pursue vigorously its efforts to obtain judicial resolution of the permitting impasse and to pursue all possible options for implementing the mandated site characterization program in accordance with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The Committee believes that it is only through conduct of the detailed site characterization and testing program that the Yucca Mountain site will ultimately be proven either suitable or unsuitable for development as a repository.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $292,833,000, the full budget request, based on its belief that this is an extremely important program that demands priority attention within the Department. The Committee notes that the administration's fiscal year 1991 budget request is significantly less than the amount requested in previous years, reflecting the current impasse and obstacles to continued field work at Yucca Mountain. Until such time as these obstacles are removed, the Committee believes it is also appropriate to limit the level of funding provided to the State of Nevada and to affected local governments. Therefore, the Committee has provided not more than $4,000,000 to the State of Nevada for the conduct of its oversight responsibilities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, of which $750,000 is to be available to the University of Nevada, Reno, for infrastructure studies related to nuclear waste, and of which $250,000 is to be available for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, to carry out transportation studies related to nuclear waste. Within the available $4,000,000 provided to the State of Nevada, $125,000 is to be available to the Nevada Legislative Committee on High-Level Radioactive Waste to carry out its oversight responsibilities.

The Committee has provided not more than $5,900,000 to affected local governments for appropriate activities pursuant to the act. In addition to the $5,900,000 provided above, an amount not to exceed $200,000 may be provided to Nye County, NV, to develop a radiological health investigation to assess potential public health impacts from radiation association with transportation of nuclear waste; an additional amount not to exceed $200,000 may be provided to Clark County to study new water resources in southern Nevada in connection with this program; and an additional amount not to exceed $100,000 may be provided to Lincoln County to support public information and education development programs and to conduct socioeconomic and economic development analyses related to the Yucca Mountain project.

Within the overall appropriation of $292,833,000, the Department shall provide $1,000,000 for a mobile sampling platform and laboratory at the Environmental Center at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas for conduct of an independent sample analysis verification program. An additional amount of up to $4,000,000 shall be available for infrastructure studies and other research and development work to be carried out by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and the University of Nevada, Reno.

ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION FUND

Appropriations, 1990	$16,016,000
Budget estimate, 1991	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	

The Department, through the Isotope Production and Distribution Program, provides radioactive and stable isotope products and associated services to a wide and varied domestic and international market. These materials and services are produced, processed, and provided through the utilization of DOE facilities and scientific capabilities which exist to satisfy other DOE research and production missions. Ultimate applications of isotope products include medical research and health care, industrial research and manufacturing, agriculture, food preservation, education, and national defense. Prices for the products are established to recover program costs while revenues realized from the sales are retained by the program as an offset to costs and investments in processes, improvements, unique equipment, and isotope research.

The Fiscal Year 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Public Law 101-101, authorized a separate "Isotope production and distribution" account with an initial capitalization of $16,200,000 and the ability to retain revenues. The revenues are estimated to be $16,200,000 in fiscal year 1990.

In keeping with Government policies and practices, prices are set for products offered under this program in a manner that will not discourage the use of the products nor the development of domestic sources of supply independent of DOE.

The appropriation language will allow retention of revenues received for use in funding isotope production, sale and distribution activities of the Department.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1990	$7,936,225,000
Budget estimate, 1991	6,994,515,000
House allowance	8,921,330,000
Committee recommendation	8,964,040,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1990	$1,709,968,000
Budget estimate, 1991	1,597,485,000
House allowance	1,993,818,000
Committee recommendation	2,016,218,000

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of $10,980,258,000 for atomic energy defense activities.

The appropriation recommended for atomic energy defense activities supports the research, development, testing, production and stockpile maintenance for nuclear weapons, inertial confinement fusion, naval reactors development, verification and control technology, special materials production, defense environmental restoration and waste management, and nuclear materials security and safeguards.

As discussed earlier in this report, the administration proposed combining defense and nondefense environmental restoration and waste management activities into a single appropriation account. The Committee agreed with the House Committee and rejected this proposal, and has included the defense-related cleanup activities under the "Atomic energy defense" appropriation. The recommended funding level for fiscal year 1991 reflects the increased funding associated with these environmental restoration activities.

TECHNOLOGY COMMERCIALIZATION INITIATIVE

The Committee notes that the Department of Energy is pursuing a new and innovative technology commercialization initiative. The Committee applauds the initiative and believes it will greatly enhance U.S. competitiveness by drawing on the significant investment in the Department's high technology defense capabilities through cooperative arrangements with the U.S. private sector. The Committee urges the Department to proceed with this technology commercialization initiative in fiscal year 1991.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

This program provides for the research, development, engineering, testing, and production of all U.S. nuclear weapons; maintenance of reliable weapons for their stockpile life; and retirement and disposal of nuclear weapons from the stockpile. The fiscal year 1991 recommendation will continue efforts to provide new technology to maintain a modern nuclear force, along with the design and development of new weapons systems in response to defense requirements.

The Committee recommendation for weapons activities totals $4,495,204,000 of which $3,780,381,000 is operating expenses and $714,823,000 is for plant and capital equipment. No funds are provided for the Follow-on-to-Lance Missile Program and modernization of the 155 mm artillery fired atomic projectile [AFAP].

Weapons activities are comprised of the following subcategories: research and development, testing activities, production and surveillance, and program direction.

Research and development.—The Committee recommends $1,206,661,000 for research and development activities, a decrease of $134,000,000 below the 1990 level and $102,306,000 below the budget request.

Within the Committee recommendation of $823,664,000 in operating expenses for these activities, the Committee approves $20,000,000 to carry out the goals of the National Competitiveness Technology Transfer Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-189) as currently being implemented by DOE. The Committee is encouraged with the Department's progress in technology transfer and urges the Secretary to expedite the implementation of this act.

The Committee has included the budget request for project 88-D-105, the Special Nuclear Materials R&D Laboratory replacement, at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico. Funding for the Special Nuclear Materials R&D Laboratory shall not be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Energy has submitted a 5-year budget plan detailing long-term plans for funding programs and projects of the national security programs for the Department of Energy, including plutonium processing, required by the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1990.

The Committee understands that requests have been made, as a result of the recently concluded United States-Japan trade agreement regarding supercomputers, to acquire, and perform research evaluation and assessment, of a Japanese supercomputer and its technology at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. As a part of the assessment of advanced technology, R&D and evaluation programs under special projects, funds may be used for such purposes subject to approval by the Secretary of Energy and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate.

Testing.—The Committee recommendation for testing activities totals $487,160,000 which reflects a reduction of about $80,000,000 below fiscal year 1990.

The Committee recommendation for testing activities totals $487,160,000, which is the same as the budget request, excluding nuclear directed energy weapons funding. Funds for nuclear directed energy weapons, $88,393,000 of which was requested in the testing program, have been included in a separate account as described in the following section.

The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the Marshall Islands radiological activities.

The Committee is concerned that the recent decision to transfer the Northern Marshall Island program out of the weapons testing program was made without a full review of the costs and benefits of such a transfer, and without the benefit of conclusions from the ongoing National Academy of Science review of important programs activities. Accordingly, the Committee directs that the Northern Marshall Island program continue to operate within the weapons testing program, as it has in previous years, until the review by the National Academy of Sciences has been completed, and until the Committee has had an opportunity to review the Department's justification for such a transfer.

Production and surveillance.—The Committee recommendation for production and surveillance totals $2,588,054,000 a reduction of $169,946,000 below the budget request. No funds are provided for the Follow-on-to-Lance Missile Program and modernization of the 155 mm artillery fired atomic projectile [AFAP].

Full funding has been provided for project 89–D–125, plutonium recovery modification project, at the Rocky Flats plant, subject to authorization by the Congress. Despite the Committee's serious concern that the total estimated cost of the project has increased significantly, the fundamental need for safe, reliable processing of plutonium residues and retired weapon parts remains. The Secretary of Energy is urged to complete the testing and validation of the proposed technology and processes on a full-scale demonstration basis prior to obligating line-item construction funds. The Committee expects the Department to take every action possible to avoid the failures exhibited in the management and construction of the original Building 371 project.

The Committee has agreed to the House amendment restricting use of the funds until 30 days after receipt of the Secretary's review of the modernization report, except that $15,000,000 for non-site specific design activities and activities supporting ongoing preparation of the EIS may be used, also subject to authorization by the Congress.

Nuclear directed energy weapons.—The Committee recommendation for nuclear directed energy weapons is $106,904,000 a reduction of $85,000,000.

The budget structure presented by the Department provided funding for this activity in two separate program areas, R&D and testing. The Committee recommendation consolidates the request into a single amount for nuclear directed energy weapons which should provide for increased efficiency in administering this program. Funding requests in the amount of $103,511,000 was transferred from the R&D program and $88,393,000 from the testing program.

Inertial confinement fusion.—The Committee recommendation for inertial confinement fusion [ICF] is $166,800,000 which includes a recommendation of $157,900,000 for operating expenses and $8,400,000 for capital equipment.

The Committee is aware of the National Academy of Science's interim report of the Department of Energy's Inertial Confinement Fusion Program which notes that the ICF Program on the whole is "* * * a well-managed and well-executed effort that attracts extremely able scientists and engineers to a clear and important national objective." The Committee has been advised that the NAS final report, due September 1990, is not expected to contain major changes. Upon the Secretary's approval, the Committee expects the Department to implement the program consistent with the priorities and recommendations included in the NAS report on the ICF Program.

The Committee is advised that recent results from Nova experiments and analysis provided since the NAS interim report which strongly indicate that ignition and energy gain, the last remaining major ICF scientific milestone, could be achieved by the end of this decade with a Nova upgrade.

Implementation of these priorities and recommendations would require redistribution of budget allocations within the ICF Program to focus resources on the highest priority initiatives. The Committee expects the Department to take every action necessary to focus the full amount of this ICF appropriation on the priorities and recommendations identified by the reviews and advise the Committee.

Also, the budget request of $10,000,000 for target development, production, and delivery is approved and the contractor for this activity is to be funded at no less than this amount.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The Materials Production Program provides nuclear materials to meet near-term national defense and nondefense requirements. In addition, materials production sustains a base production program capable of meeting long-term nuclear materials production requirements consistent with the annual Presidential nuclear weapons stockpile memorandum and the annual Department of Energy materials management plan.

The materials production program operates a reactor feed material production complex, production reactors at Savannah River, spent fuel chemical processing plants at Savannah River Site, SC, Richland, WA, and the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory in Idaho Falls, ID, and various other sites. These facilities are unique to the production of nuclear materials for defense purposes.

The Committee recommendation for materials production totals $2,341,900,000, of which $1,892,770,000 is for operating expenses, and $449,130,000 is for plant and capital equipment. This is an increase of almost $80,000,000 over the fiscal 1990 appropriation.

The Materials Production Program is organized into the following subcategories: Reactor operations, processing of nuclear materials, supporting services, enriched material, capital equipment, and program direction.

Reactor operations.—The Committee recommendation for reactor operations is $865,338,000, which is $2,000,000 less than the budget request, but an increase of $90,351,000 over the fiscal year 1990 funding level. The significant increase over the prior year is due to activities needed to restart the Savannah River reactors.

Processing of nuclear materials.—The Committee recommendation for processing of nuclear materials totals $637,469,000, an increase of $13,070,000 over fiscal year 1990, and the same as the budget request.

The Committee is very concerned that no clear long-term strategy insists for future processing of plutonium for defense requirements. Many of the existing facilities are obsolete and the technologies employed are not state of the art in terms of minimizing radiation exposure and waste.

Over the past decade, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory [LLNL] has assembled a major scientific and engineering capability in the area of plutonium processing as a key part of the laser isotope separation program. This cadre of highly skilled personnel has developed the expertise to design and integrate the specific technologies and items of equipment into optimize processing systems where the operation of each critical item has been demonstrated by thorough testing. The design of a fully integrated plutonium processing facility for production operations that has an approved EIS and that minimizes waste, reduces radiation dosed to workers, and meets or exceeds all modern standards of waste disposal is an exceptional accomplishment in todays environment. The integrated team which achieved this success is a unique resource to the Nation and the Department of Energy. It is important to maintain this successful team as well as the modern systems and facilities at LLNL in order that these highly specialized and scarce technical resources can be focused to support the national strategy which must be developed for plutonium processing in the DOE nuclear weapons complex. Premature dismantling of this capability could: (1) lead to significantly delays in developing the required quality of future plutonium processing facilities for the complex, most notably with respect to achieving the major improvements which are possible in environment safety and health, and waste management; (2) effective result in a significant reduction in the already very limited number of high caliber project oriented plutonium technologists and other expertise essential for the timely and successful implementation of whatever the future national plutonium strategy may be; and (3) lead to increased costs in the longer term associated with the need to assemble an equivalent team that will be required to implement whatever national plan emerges.

As long as the U.S. nuclear deterrent utilizes plutonium, a processing capability will be required. However, the technologies in today's production complex are largely obsolete and in many cases are inconsistent with the goals of the Secretary of Energy for a modernized production complex. Over 10 years ago the special isotope separation [SIS] program initiated activities to respond to the need to systematically develop, engineer, and integrate processes and hardware to minimize waste generation and personnel radiation exposure, while simultaneously improving overall productivity. The multidisciplinary, project oriented team assembled within LLNL during the past decade from a wide spectrum of diverse technical organizations is relatively unique in technical depth, breadth of perspective, an freedom from day-to-day production constraints. This highly integrated LLNL effort has, in fact, constituted the driving force behind many of the recent proposed technology improvements for the future. If dissolved at this early date, there will be critical loss of technology perspective to the DOE while it plans for future modernization.

An investment of $66,500,000 in fiscal 1991 will not only preserve this capability vital to DOE while a national strategy is being devised, but will also provide for development and demonstration of some major improvements in plutonium processing technology.

PUREX processing plant.—This facility reprocesses fuel from the reactors at Hanford, WA. The Committee is advised that no decision has been made regarding the future of this facility. The Secretary of Energy has directed a study in order to determine the alternatives, one of which could be the use of this facility as a waste management option.

In light of the historical and recent operating record of PUREX, the Department should consider the completion of an environmental impact statement prior to reopening this facility. Also, consistent with the Department's expressed policy, the Committee requests that operation of the PUREX facility not be resumed until completion of an independent safety review by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, including completion of significant health and safety upgrades if recommended by such a review. Further, the Committee requests that a comprehensive assessment be conducted, with independent oversight, which explore all the available options, including long-term interim storage and direct disposal, and other such options that would not require operation of PUREX or an oxidation facility. Reports on these two matters should be transmitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. Pending further information and the Secretary's decision, the Committee disapproves of the proposed transfer of PUREX to waste management as proposed in the budget justifications.

Supporting services.—The Committee recommendation for supporting services totals $573,170,000, which is $10,000,000 less than the budget request due to fiscal constraints, but which is an increase of $15,324,000 over the current year funding level.

Enriched materials.—The Committee recommendation for enriched materials is $117,801,000, which is the same as the budget request.

The recommendation approves the amended budget request to reduce the appropriations for enriched materials by $59,100,000 to offset proposed increases in other programs as submitted by the Secretary of Energy and the President. The Committee was advised that the reduction reflects reduced requirements for naval fuel which can be taken without adversely impacting fleet readiness.

Capital equipment and program management.—The Committee has provided $105,622,000 for capital equipment. This is the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation for program direction is $42,500,000, which is also the same as the budget request.

WASTE TRANSPORTATION AND SITE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Transportation and Site Management Program includes the departmentwide transportation management activities to assure the safe, secure, and economical transportation of DOE materials including radioactive and other hazardous materials and waste. This program also funds the landlord responsibilities at the Idaho and Richland operations office sites where funds are used for maintenance, procurement and construction of common use equipment, facilities, utilities and roadways.

The Committee recommendation is $85,130,000 which is $870,000 less than the budget request of $86,000,000. Budget constraints have limited the number of new construction starts funded in fiscal year 1991.

The Committee requests included funds to assist States that will be impacted by nuclear waste shipments from Federal facilities. Especially in light of the Department's position to proceed with TRU waste shipments to the waste isolation pilot project [WIPP], the Department should finalize plans in consulation with the States and should include shipments from Hanford during the 5-year test phase.

NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS

The New Production Reactors Program provides for the acquisition, including design and construction, of new production reactor capability to meet national security requirements. Activities include planning, development, and execution of program strategy and management and application of standard for safety, quality, environmental, and performance factors into the design and construction of new production reactor capability.

The Committee has provided $375,000,000, the same as the budget request, for the continued acquisition, design, and construction of new production reactors to meet national security requirements. This is $12,000,000 more than the House allowance.

The Committee recommendation includes the Department's proposed increased funding submitted in late June to restore $10,000,000 in construction funds which had been reprogrammed as well as provide $2,000,000 in operation funds for safety oversite activities. These funds are necessary to support the design efforts and the safety reviews of those efforts for both reactor technology in the revised new production reactors program acquisitions plan.

The Committee expects that upon completion of the conceptual design that the Department will furnish the Congress with an updated total estimated cost for the two preferred reactor technologies.

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

The Naval Reactors Development Program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships.

The Committee recommendation includes $652,000,000 for the Naval Reactor Development Program. This is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT (DEFENSE)

The administration proposed in the fiscal year 1991 budget submission a new, single appropriation account for environmental restoration and waste management. This would have consolidated all defense and nondefense environmental cleanup activities that have historically been included in several appropriation accounts. The Committee's recommendation has maintained the separation of defense and nondefense funds for cleanup activities.

This program encompasses four categories of activities: Corrective activities are necessary to bring DOE facilities into compliance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations; waste management includes the treatment, storage, and disposal of radioactive, hazardous, mixed or sanitary wastes generated as a result of ongoing operations at active facilities; environmental restoration includes the assessment and cleanup of surplus facilities and inactive sites; and technology development is an applied research and development initiative to support environmental restoration and waste management activities.

An appropriation of $2,680,616,000 is recommended for environmental cleanup activities at the Department's defense facilities. The amount recommended is an increase of $318,865,000 over the budget request.

The Committee is encouraged by the Department's commitment to environmental cleanup at its nuclear facilities and by the Department's development of a long-term strategy for carrying out this effort. The Committee also urges the Department to continue its efforts to enter into compliance agreements for cleanup of each of its nuclear facilities. The Committee is concerned, however, that many of the Department's priorities for cleanup are now driven by the schedules and deadlines established under compliance agreements for individual facilities. As such, these schedules and deadlines are driven by negotiations between DOE and individual States rather than by any comprehensive departmentwide cleanup priorities. The Committee is concerned, therefore, that priorities for cleanup could ultimately be determined by judicial actions rather than by a coordinated national plan that appropriately balances public health risks, environmental protection, costs, availability of technology, and other important factors.

The Committee believes that it is desirable to develop a comprehensive mechanism for establishing priorities for cleanup and corrective actions at the Department's facilities. The Department is directed to develop a proposed mechanism for establishing cleanup priorities. It is important that such priority system include a method to weigh the relative importance of health risks, environmental protection, regulatory requirements, socioeconomic impacts, and cost minimization. In developing such a priority system, the Department is directed to consult closely with and coordinate its activities with appropriate agencies, the States in which the Department's facilities are located, and other interested parties. The Department is to report to the Appropriation Committees and other appropriate committees within 120 days of enactment of this act, its proposed mechanism or proposals for establishing cleanup priorities.

General.—The Committee concurs with the House Committee and is aware that the Department has entered into agreements with various States outlining required cleanup activities. To the extent that these funds were included in to budget request and funds were appropriated, the Department should ensure that funds are provided to honor such agreements.

It is the intent of the Committee that the Department should ensure that funds are used only for waste cleanup purposes identified in the budget or as directed by Congress in the appropriation reports.

Funds not expended for environmental restoration and waste management activities as a result of program slippage shall be offset against those activities where such slippage occurs. Further, if the actual slippage is less than the amount indicated in the report accompanying this bill, then reductions up to that amount should be taken in such a manner as to minimize adverse impact on the program.

Defense high-level waste disposal fee.—The Committee is aware that the Department published a final notice in the Federal Register (vol. 52, No. 161, August 20, 1987) in which it announced the methodology for calculating the appropriate allocation for costs for the disposal of defense high-level waste in a repository with the funds to be appropriated by the Congress from the Department's Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program for payment into the nuclear waste fund.

The Committee is concerned that, as of September 30, 1989, the estimated amount due was $483,000,000, and no such payment into the nuclear waste fund have been made to date and , therefore, recommends that $5,000,000 of the funds provided herein be deposited in the nuclear waste fund for the purpose of demonstrating the Department's good faith and intentions regarding payment of these costs.

Fernald litigation.—The Committee has provided the full amount of the second incremental payment of $20,500,000 on the $73,000,000 settlement in the *Fernald* case.

This requirement was incurred by the Department in its handling of the litigation when it entered into an agreement with the plaintiffs in the Fernald litigation in June 1989 and these funds are now needed to satisfy its obligations under the terms of that settlement.

Hanford tri-party agreement.—The Department of Energy, along with the Environmental Protection Agency, have signed a tri-party agreement with the State of Washington putting into place a 30-

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(199,395,000)	(215,529,000)	(215,529,000)	(215,529,000)
(Capital equipment)	(19,720,000)	(26,700,000)	(26,700,000)	(26,700,000)
(Construction)	(71,485,000)	(88,500,000)	(88,500,000)	(88,500,000)
III. General Science program direction - OE	3,846,000	3,950,000	3,950,000	3,950,000
IV. Superconducting super collider				
Operating expenses	68,034,000	116,000,000	116,000,000	116,000,000
Capital equipment	20,706,000	33,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000
Construction:				
90-R-106 Superconducting Super Collider	128,992,000	168,866,000	168,866,000	168,866,000
Subtotal, Superconducting super collider	217,732,000	317,866,000	317,866,000	317,866,000
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	1,098,829,000	1,273,732,000	1,273,732,000	1,273,732,000
(Operating expenses)	(737,566,000)	(829,634,000)	(829,634,000)	(829,634,000)
(Capital equipment)	(124,729,000)	(147,880,000)	(147,880,000)	(147,880,000)
(Construction)	(236,534,000)	(296,218,000)	(296,218,000)	(296,218,000)

year timetable for cleanup and stabilization of a portion of the defense waste contamination at Hanford, WA. Such an agreement was entered into in April 1988 in lieu of protracted legal proceedings, although failure to comply with the tri-party agreement might still expose the Department to legal enforcement action by the State. It was intended that the tri-party agreement would be the implementation plan for the Federal Government by which the State could be assured that the highest priority cleanup requirements would be undertaken ahead of lesser priority activities. The Committee expects that with funds provided by this and other appropriations acts, that the Department of Energy will give highest priority to funding those activities specifically outlined in the tri-party agreement and refrain from reallocating funds to other activities at Hanford that are not covered by the agreement unless requirements an considerations of health and safety dictate otherwise.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

This program provides for the research, development, testing, and support activities related to the detection of nuclear test activities in response to treaty verification and national security requirements; analysis and support for nuclear intelligence, export control and arms control issues; and the review of export licenses applications as required by the Atomic Energy Act as amended, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978, and the Export Administration Act of 1979.

In addition, the fiscal year 1991 program provides for the of verification technologies for special nuclear materials, a START treaty, and increased analytical support activities.

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology operating expenses provides $181,484,000 which is $30,000,000 more than the budget request.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $91,000,000 for nuclear materials security and safeguards development, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

This program includes activities to assure adequate protection of nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, facilities, and classified information against theft, sabotage, espionage, and terrorist activities. The program focuses on providing safeguards technical support to United States and international activities designed to minimize the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

Activities funded under this heading include those functions necessary for granting appropriate security clearances to agency and Government contractor personnel who must, in the performance of their work, have access to restricted data, national security information or special nuclear material, or who occupy a designated critical sensitive position.

The recommendation includes $65,000,000 for security investigations. This the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendation, current year estimates, the budget request, and House allowance are shown in the following table:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES				
I. Research and development				
A. Research and development - weapons				
Operating expenses..............................	790,728,000	813,664,000	793,664,000	823,664,000
Capital equipment..............................	92,467,000	91,300,000	91,300,000	91,300,000
Construction:				
GP-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	20,419,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
90-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, & testing facilities revitalization, Phase III, various locations	985,000	19,600,000	9,600,000	9,600,000
88-D-105 Special nuclear materials R & D laboratory replacement, LANL, Los Alamos, NM..	43,340,000	20,600,000	---	20,600,000
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development, & testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, various locations..................	74,269,000	72,547,000	72,547,000	72,547,000
Subtotal, Construction..........................	139,013,000	132,747,000	102,147,000	122,747,000
Subtotal, Research and development - weapons.......	1,022,208,000	1,037,711,000	987,111,000	1,037,711,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Nuclear directed energy weapons				
Operating expenses	95,545,000	91,211,000	---	---
Capital equipment	5,910,000	7,300,000	---	---
Construction:				
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, (NDER facility at LLNL)	18,715,000	5,000,000	---	---
Subtotal, Nuclear directed energy weapons	120,170,000	103,511,000	---	---
C. Inertial fusion				
Operating expenses	162,722,000	157,900,000	157,900,000	157,900,000
Capital equipment	8,609,000	8,900,000	17,100,000	8,900,000
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	171,331,000	166,800,000	175,000,000	166,800,000
D. Environment, safety and health				
Construction:				
90-D-103 ES&H improvements, various locations.	10,540,000	---	---	---
88-D-102 Sanitary wastewater systems consolidation, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	3,054,000	---	---	---
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,122,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	18,716,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Safeguards and security				
Construction:				
88-D-104 Safeguards and security upgrade, Phase II, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	985,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
87-D-104 Safeguards and security enhancement II, LLNL, Livermore, CA	6,895,000	---	1,150,000	1,150,000
Subtotal, Safeguards and security	7,880,000	1,000,000	2,150,000	2,150,000
Subtotal, Research and development	1,340,305,000	1,309,022,000	1,164,261,000	1,206,661,000
II. Testing				
A. Weapons program				
Operating expenses	415,374,000	442,268,000	442,268,000	442,268,000
Capital equipment	39,814,000	33,550,000	33,550,000	33,550,000
Construction:				
GP-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	7,289,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
Subtotal, Weapons program	462,477,000	482,918,000	482,918,000	482,918,000
B. Nuclear directed energy weapons				
Operating expenses	88,650,000	84,443,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	7,880,000	3,950,000	---	---
Subtotal, Nuclear directed energy weapons	96,530,000	88,393,000	---	---
C. Safeguards and security				
Construction:				
85-D-105 Combined device assembly facility, Nevada Test Site, NV	9,318,000	4,242,000	4,242,000	4,242,000
Subtotal, Testing	568,325,000	575,553,000	487,160,000	487,160,000
Subtotal, Research, development and testing	1,908,630,000	1,884,575,000	1,651,421,000	1,693,821,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,553,019,000)	(1,589,486,000)	(1,393,832,000)	(1,423,832,000)
(Capital equipment)	(154,680,000)	(145,000,000)	(141,950,000)	(133,750,000)
(Construction)	(200,931,000)	(150,089,000)	(115,639,000)	(136,239,000)
III. Nuclear directed energy weapons				
Operating expenses	---	---	175,654,000	90,654,000
Capital equipment	---	---	11,250,000	11,250,000
Construction:				
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II (NDER facility at LLNL)	---	---	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Nuclear directed energy weapons	---	---	191,904,000	106,904,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Production and surveillance				
Operating expenses	2,068,500,000	2,299,880,000	2,161,180,000	2,161,180,000
Capital equipment	123,716,000	128,571,000	128,571,000	128,571,000
Construction:				
Decision costs:				
91-D-122 Short range attack missile tactical (SRAM-T) production facilities	---	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
90-D-122 Production capabilities from the nuclear depth/strike bomb (ND/SB), various locations	7,880,000	13,700,000	13,700,000	13,700,000
90-D-123 Follow on to lance warhead production facilities, various locations	---	3,500,000	---	---
87-D-122 Short-range attack missile II (SRAM II) warhead production facilities, various locations	40,582,000	8,634,000	8,634,000	8,634,000
Subtotal, Decision costs	48,462,000	40,834,000	37,334,000	37,334,000
Production base:				
Facilities capability assurance program:				
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	81,853,000	131,806,000	106,806,000	106,806,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Production support facilities:				
GP-D-121 General plant projects, various locations	30,387,000	36,350,000	36,350,000	36,350,000
91-D-123 Production assurance transformer replacement, Kansas City Plant...........	---	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
90-D-124 High explosives (HE) synthesis facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	1,773,000	---	---	---
89-D-122 Production waste storage facility Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN................	9,062,000	---	---	---
89-D-125 Plutonium recovery modification project (Bldg. 371), Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	44,325,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000
88-D-125 High explosive machining facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX...............	35,460,000	8,840,000	8,840,000	8,840,000
86-D-130 Tritium loading facility replacement, Savannah River Plant, Aiken, SC	23,665,000	2,360,000	2,360,000	2,360,000
Subtotal, Production support facilities	144,672,000	115,150,000	115,150,000	115,150,000
Subtotal, Production base - construction	226,525,000	246,956,000	221,956,000	221,956,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Environment, safety and health:				
91-D-126 Health physics calibration facility (HPCF), Mound, Miamisburg, OH.......	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
91-D-127 Criticality alarm and production annunciation utility replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO............................	---	6,600,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
91-D-125 Environment, safety and health, Phase III, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH.......	---	1,746,000	---	---
90-D-125 Steam plant ash disposal facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	1,477,000	---	---	---
90-D-126 Environment, safety and health improvements, various locations.............	26,300,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
89-D-126 Environment, safety and health upgrade, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	3,447,000	488,000	488,000	488,000
88-D-124 Fire protection upgrading, various locations..................................	5,319,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	1,481,000
88-D-126 Personnel radiological monitoring laboratories, various locations	---	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health.......	36,543,000	21,415,000	19,669,000	19,669,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Safeguards and security:				
91-D-124 Safeguards and security upgrades, phase III, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH....	---	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	5,417,000	18,244,000	18,244,000	18,244,000
Subtotal, Safeguards and security.............	5,417,000	19,344,000	19,344,000	19,344,000
Subtotal, Construction...........................	316,947,000	328,549,000	298,303,000	298,303,000
Subtotal, Production and surveillance................	2,509,163,000	2,757,000,000	2,588,054,000	2,588,054,000
V. Program direction				
Operating expenses				
1. Weapons program	87,520,000	95,514,000	95,514,000	95,514,000
2. Community assistance	8,914,000	9,201,000	9,201,000	9,201,000
Subtotal, Operating expenses.....................	96,434,000	104,715,000	104,715,000	104,715,000
Capital equipment	1,709,000	1,710,000	1,710,000	1,710,000
Subtotal, Program direction........................	98,143,000	106,425,000	106,425,000	106,425,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES............................	4,515,936,000	4,748,000,000	4,537,804,000	4,495,204,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)................................	(3,717,953,000)	(3,994,081,000)	(3,835,381,000)	(3,780,381,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	(280,105,000)	(275,281,000)	(283,481,000)	(275,281,000)
(Construction)................................	(517,878,000)	(478,638,000)	(418,942,000)	(439,542,000)
MATERIALS PRODUCTION				
I. Reactor operations				
Operating expenses..............................	704,378,000	811,457,000	811,457,000	811,457,000
Construction:				
Environment, safety and health:				
91-D-148 Reactor charge/discharge training simulator, Savannah River Site, SC............	---	2,000,000	---	---
90-D-142 Coal storage facility environmental upgrade, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	906,000	---	---	---
90-D-150 Reactor safety assurance, Savannah River, SC..............................	12,509,000	32,600,000	32,600,000	32,600,000
89-D-141 M-Area waste disposal, Savannah River, SC	7,683,000	---	---	---
89-D-142 Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River, SC	39,400,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-D-148 Improved reactor confinement system, Savannah River, SC............................	6,994,000	12,800,000	12,800,000	12,800,000
86-D-152 Reactor electrical distribution system, Savannah River, SC	3,117,000	---	---	---
85-D-145 Fuel prod. fac., Savannah River, SC...	---	8,481,000	8,481,000	8,481,000
Subtotal, Construction............................	70,609,000	55,881,000	53,881,000	53,881,000
Subtotal, Reactor operations..........................	774,987,000	867,338,000	865,338,000	865,338,000
II. Processing of nuclear materials				
Operating expenses	580,764,000	628,969,000	628,969,000	628,969,000
Construction:				
Programmatic projects:				
86-D-148 Special isotope separation project, Idaho Falls, ID..............................	39,400,000	---	---	---
Environment, safety and health:				
90-D-141 Idaho chemical processing plant fire protection, Idaho Falls, ID.............	3,447,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-D-143 Plutonium finishing plant fire safety and loss limitation, Richland, WA	788,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health........	4,235,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
Subtotal, Construction...........................	43,635,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
Subtotal, Processing of nuclear materials.............	624,399,000	637,469,000	637,469,000	637,469,000
III. Supporting services				
Operating expenses	278,625,000	302,043,000	292,043,000	292,043,000
Construction:				
Programmatic projects:				
91-D-143 Increase 751-A elec substation capacity, Savannah River Site, SC............	---	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
GP-D-146 General plant projects, various locations	36,250,000	36,994,000	36,994,000	36,994,000
90-D-151 Engineering Ctr, Savannah River, SC.	6,895,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
86-D-149 Productivity retention program, Phases I thru VI, various locations..........	80,553,000	61,750,000	61,750,000	61,750,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-139 Fuel processing restoration, Idaho Fuel Processing Facility, INEL, ID	73,875,000	87,500,000	87,500,000	87,500,000
Subtotal, Programmatic projects................	197,573,000	196,244,000	196,244,000	196,244,000
Environment, safety and health:				
91-D-145 New whole body counter facility, Savannah River Site, SC......................	---	4,350,000	4,350,000	4,350,000
90-D-149 Plantwide fire protection, Phases I and II, Savannah River, SC..................	4,826,000	49,100,000	49,100,000	49,100,000
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	54,284,000	14,133,000	14,133,000	14,133,000
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health.......	59,110,000	67,583,000	67,583,000	67,583,000
Safeguards and security:				
89-D-140 Additional separations safeguards, Savannah River, SC	10,146,000	16,300,000	16,300,000	16,300,000
88-D-153 Additional reactor safeguards, Savannah River, SC..........................	6,304,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-156 Plantwide safeguards systems, Savannah River, SC	6,088,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Safeguards and security	22,538,000	17,300,000	17,300,000	17,300,000
Subtotal, Construction	279,221,000	281,127,000	281,127,000	281,127,000
Subtotal, Supporting services	557,846,000	583,170,000	573,170,000	573,170,000
IV. Enriched material	166,366,000	117,801,000	117,900,000	117,801,000
V. Capital equipment	102,859,000	105,622,000	105,622,000	105,622,000
VI. Program direction	34,736,000	42,500,000	42,500,000	42,500,000
TOTAL, MATERIALS PRODUCTION	2,261,193,000	2,353,900,000	2,341,999,000	2,341,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,764,869,000)	(1,902,770,000)	(1,892,869,000)	(1,892,770,000)
(Capital equipment)	(102,859,000)	(105,622,000)	(105,622,000)	(105,622,000)
(Construction)	(393,465,000)	(345,508,000)	(343,508,000)	(343,508,000)
DEFENSE WASTE AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION				
I. Environmental restoration - operating expenses	563,420,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Waste operations and projects				
Operating expenses	689,201,000	---	---	---
Construction:				
Programmatic projects:				
90-D-170 GPP, various locations	28,600,000	---	---	---
89-D-171 INEL road renovation, ID	7,289,000	---	---	---
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	9,220,000	---	---	---
88-D-173 Hanford waste vitrification plant (HWVP), Richland, WA	28,664,000	---	---	---
87-D-173 242-A Evaporator crystallizer upgrade, Richland, WA	690,000	---	---	---
87-D-181 Diversion box and pump pit containment buildings, Savannah River, SC	2,748,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Programmatic projects	77,211,000	---	---	---
Environment, safety and health:				
90-D-171 Laboratory ventilation and electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA	1,083,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA	1,280,000	---	---	---
90-D-173 B-plant canyon crane replacement, Richland, WA	1,477,000	---	---	---
90-D-174 Decontamination laundry facility, Richland, WA	2,758,000	---	---	---
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance-I, Richland, WA	4,137,000	---	---	---
90-D-176 Transuranic (TRU) waste facility, Savannah River, SC	3,053,000	---	---	---
90-D-177 RWMC Transuranic (TRU) waste treatment and storage facility, ID	4,925,000	---	---	---
90-D-178 TSA retrieval containment building, ID	5,910,000	---	---	---
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance, Richland, WA	27,186,000	---	---	---
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	15,169,000	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-D-175 Hazardous waste/mixed waste disposal facility, Savannah River, SC	6,343,000	---	---	---
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	13,928,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health.......	87,249,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction...........................	164,460,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Waste operations and projects...............	853,661,000	---	---	---
III. Waste research and development..................	113,497,000	---	---	---
IV. Hazardous waste and compliance technology........	39,561,000	---	---	---
V. Transportation management........................	11,663,000	---	---	---
VI. Capital equipment................................	49,374,000	---	---	---
VII. Program direction...............................	2,906,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE WASTE AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION....	1,634,082,000	---	---	---
(Operating expenses)................................	(1,420,248,000)	---	---	---
(Capital equipment)................................	(49,374,000)	---	---	---
(Construction)................................	(164,460,000)	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
WASTE TRANSPORTATION AND SITE MANAGEMENT				
I. Transportation management				
Operating expenses	---	14,660,000	14,660,000	14,660,000
Capital equipment	---	531,000	531,000	531,000
Subtotal, Transportation management	---	15,191,000	15,191,000	15,191,000
II. Program direction/landlord				
Operating expenses	---	21,386,000	21,386,000	21,386,000
Capital equipment	---	18,567,000	18,567,000	18,567,000
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General plant projects	---	13,556,000	13,556,000	13,556,000
91-D-170 INEL transportation complex, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	---	870,000	---	---
91-D-175 300 area electrical distribution conversion and safety improvements, phase I Richland, WA	---	900,000	900,000	900,000
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance-I, Richland, WA	---	8,230,000	8,230,000	8,230,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-D-171 INEL road renovation, ID	---	7,300,000	7,300,000	7,300,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	30,856,000	29,986,000	29,986,000
TOTAL, WASTE TRANSPORTATION AND SITE MANAGEMENT	---	86,000,000	85,130,000	85,130,000
(Operating expenses)	---	(36,046,000)	(36,046,000)	(36,046,000)
(Capital equipment)	---	(19,098,000)	(19,098,000)	(19,098,000)
(Construction)	---	(30,856,000)	(29,986,000)	(29,986,000)
NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS				
I. New production reactors				
Operating expenses	200,448,000	134,900,000	132,900,000	134,900,000
Capital equipment	---	8,800,000	8,800,000	8,800,000
Construction:				
88-D-154 New production reactor capacity, various locations (design only)	98,500,000	231,300,000	221,300,000	231,300,000
TOTAL, NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS	298,948,000	375,000,000	363,000,000	375,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(200,448,000)	(134,900,000)	(132,900,000)	(134,900,000)
(Capital equipment)	---	(8,800,000)	(8,800,000)	(8,800,000)
(Construction)	(98,500,000)	(231,300,000)	(221,300,000)	(231,300,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT				
I. Naval reactors development				
A. Plant development				
Operating expenses...............................	85,695,000	89,300,000	89,300,000	89,300,000
B. Reactor development				
Operating expenses...............................	241,621,000	258,900,000	258,900,000	258,900,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation				
Operating expenses...............................	213,745,000	207,000,000	207,000,000	207,000,000
D. Capital equipment................................	53,190,000	55,400,000	55,400,000	55,400,000
E. Construction				
GP-N-101 General plant projects, various locations	8,373,000	8,600,000	8,600,000	8,600,000
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	3,546,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
90-N-103 Advanced test reactor off-gas treatment system, INEL, ID	197,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-N-104 Facility renovations, Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory (KAPL), Niskayuna, NY	3,842,000	7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000
89-N-102 Heat transfer test facility, KAPL, Niskayuna, NY	6,403,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
89-N-103 Advanced test reactor modifications, Test Reactor Area, INEL, ID	3,054,000	---	---	---
89-N-104 Power system upgrade, Naval Reactors Facility, Idaho Falls, ID	6,304,000	---	---	---
88-N-102 Expended core facility receiving station, Naval Reactors Facility, ID............	2,955,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal, Construction............................	34,674,000	27,400,000	27,400,000	27,400,000
F. Program direction	13,298,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT.....................	642,223,000	652,000,000	652,000,000	652,000,000
(Operating expenses).................................	(554,359,000)	(569,200,000)	(569,200,000)	(569,200,000)
(Capital equipment).................................	(53,190,000)	(55,400,000)	(55,400,000)	(55,400,000)
(Construction).................................	(34,674,000)	(27,400,000)	(27,400,000)	(27,400,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT (DEFENSE)				
I. Corrective activities				
A. Environmental management				
Operating expenses	---	---	23,346,000	43,846,000
Capital equipment	---	---	1,980,000	1,980,000
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General Plant Project	---	---	3,720,000	3,720,000
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance	---	---	6,800,000	6,800,000
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	---	---	22,601,000	22,601,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	33,121,000	33,121,000
Subtotal, Environmental management	---	---	58,447,000	78,947,000
B. Defense programs				
Operating expenses	---	---	17,808,000	17,808,000
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General plant projects	---	---	5,259,000	5,259,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-D-103 Environment, safety and health improvements, various locations...............	---	---	4,200,000	4,200,000
90-D-125 Steam plant ash disposal facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	---	6,000,000	6,000,000
89-D-126 Environmental, safety, & health upgrade, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	---	---	1,723,000	1,723,000
89-D-142 Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River, SC........	---	---	28,000,000	28,000,000
88-D-102 Sanitary wastewaters systems consolidated, LANL, Los Alamos, NM...............	---	---	3,500,000	3,500,000
Subtotal, Construction..........................	---	---	48,682,000	48,682,000
Subtotal, Defense programs........................	---	---	66,490,000	66,490,000
Subtotal, Corrective activities......................	---	---	124,937,000	145,437,000
(Operating expenses)................................	---	---	(43,134,000)	(63,634,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	---	---	---	---
(Construction)................................	---	---	(81,803,000)	(81,803,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Environmental restoration				
Operating expenses:				
1. Facilities and sites........................	---	---	986,271,000	833,215,000
III. Waste management				
Operating expenses:				
1. Waste operations............................	---	---	1,137,927,000	1,252,927,000
Capital equipment..............................	---	---	82,019,000	82,019,000
Construction:				
GP-D-171 General plant projects................	---	---	41,154,000	41,154,000
91-D-125 Environment, safety and health upgrades, Phase III, Mound Facility Miamisburg, OH................................	---	---	---	---
91-D-173 Hazardous low-level waste processing tanks, Savannah River Site, SC......	---	---	5,800,000	5,800,000
91-D-172 High-level waste tank farm upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing plant, INEL, ID................................	---	---	13,000,000	13,000,000
91-D-171 Waste receiving and processing facility, module 1, Richland, WA...............	---	---	2,700,000	2,700,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-D-171 Laboratory ventilation and electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA..................	---	---	4,100,000	4,100,000
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA..................................	---	---	4,000,000	4,000,000
90-D-173 B-plant canyon crane replacement, Richland, WA..................................	---	---	4,300,000	4,300,000
90-D-174 Decontamination laundry facility, Richland, WA..................................	---	---	9,900,000	9,900,000
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance-I, Richland, WA	---	---	2,640,000	2,640,000
90-D-176 Transuranic (TRU) waste facility, Savannah River, SC	---	---	15,300,000	15,300,000
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste treatment and storage facility, ID............	---	---	26,000,000	26,000,000
90-D-178 TSA retrieval containment building, ID..................................	---	---	11,100,000	11,100,000
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance, Richland, WA	---	---	35,660,000	35,660,000
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	---	---	3,400,000	3,400,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	---	---	11,330,000	11,330,000
89-D-175 Hazardous waste/mixed waste disposal facility, Savannah River, SC	---	---	7,600,000	7,600,000
89-D-122 Production waste storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	---	5,500,000	5,500,000
89-D-141 M-Area waste disposal, Savannah River, SC	---	---	7,500,000	7,500,000
88-D-173 Hanford waste vitrification plant (HWVP), Richland, WA	---	---	75,500,000	75,500,000
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	---	---	4,985,000	4,985,000
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	---	---	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	296,469,000	296,469,000
Subtotal, Waste management	---	---	1,516,415,000	1,631,415,000
(Operating expenses)	---	---	(1,137,927,000)	(1,252,927,000)
(Capital equipment)	---	---	(82,019,000)	(82,019,000)
(Construction)	---	---	(296,469,000)	(296,469,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Technology development				
Operating expenses	---	---	183,480,000	183,480,000
Capital equipment	---	---	16,820,000	16,820,000
Subtotal, Technology development	---	---	200,300,000	200,300,000
Subtotal, Environ restor and waste mgmt (defense)	---	---	2,827,923,000	2,810,367,000
Program slippage due to delays in permitting	---	---	-113,116,000	-129,751,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTOR AND WASTE MGMT (DEFENSE)	(1,634,082)	---	2,714,807,000	2,680,616,000
(Operating expenses)	---	---	(2,254,516,000)	(2,220,325,000)
(Capital equipment)	---	---	(82,019,000)	(82,019,000)
(Construction)	---	---	(378,272,000)	(378,272,000)
OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS				
I. Verification and control technology				
Operating expenses	156,759,000	151,484,000	151,484,000	181,484,000
Capital equipment	9,586,000	9,924,000	9,924,000	9,924,000
Construction:				
91-D-192 Foreign Technology Assessment Center, LLNL, Livermore, CA	---	2,592,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
90-D-186 Center for national security and arms control, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	985,000	10,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	985,000	12,592,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	167,330,000	174,000,000	164,408,000	194,408,000
(Operating expenses)	(156,759,000)	(151,484,000)	(151,484,000)	(181,484,000)
(Capital equipment)	(9,586,000)	(9,924,000)	(9,924,000)	(9,924,000)
(Construction)	(985,000)	(12,592,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)
II. Nuclear safeguards and security				
Operating expenses	81,007,000	83,934,000	83,934,000	83,934,000
Capital equipment	4,892,000	5,066,000	5,066,000	5,066,000
Construction:				
GP-D-186 General plant projects	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Nuclear safeguards and security	85,899,000	91,000,000	91,000,000	91,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(81,007,000)	(83,934,000)	(83,934,000)	(83,934,000)
(Capital equipment)	(4,892,000)	(5,066,000)	(5,066,000)	(5,066,000)
(Construction)	---	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
III. Security investigations - OE	40,582,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000
TOTAL, OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS	293,811,000	330,000,000	320,408,000	350,408,000

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1990	$350,085,000
Budget estimate, 1991	407,840,000
House allowance	375,095,000
Committee recommendation	375,095,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriations, 1990	–$147,900,000
Budget estimate, 1991	–183,413,000
House allowance	–150,000,000
Committee recommendation	–150,000,000

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of $225,095,000 for departmental administration.

The appropriation recommended for departmental administration supports the Department's general management, administrative, and program support functions not directly associated with program execution. The account provides for: (1) development and analysis of alternative energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of DOE programs; (2) the salaries, travel, and other costs associated with the management and support of DOE; (3) the Institutional Relations Program that provides information services and outreach activities focusing on the industrial, academic, and public communities, evaluation of energy-related inventions and support for energy training and education; (4) development of international energy policy and international cooperation in energy matters; and (5) revenues from the sale of DOE products and services and their related direct costs.

The Committee recommendation includes $3,500,000 for the Office of Minority Economic Impact. This will continue the program at the fiscal year 1990 appropriation level.

The Committee recommends approval of $1,300,000 for the Reduced Enrichment in Research and Test Reactors [RERTR] Program as approved by the House of Representatives. These funds will provide continuing support for this important nuclear nonproliferation work under the Office of International Affairs and Energy Emergencies.

The Committee recognizes that funds received by the Department from its reimbursable activities may be used to fund general purpose capital equipment which is used in support of those activities.

REVENUES

The Department's past forecasts of revenues have been overstated, accordingly, the revenues have been reduced to $150,000,000 the current estimate; and cost of work for others and the operating programs have been reduced by a corresponding $33,413,000.

The Committee recognizes that the Department performs work for other Federal agencies. The Department had requested funds for capital equipment in the cost-of-work program to replace general purpose equipment consumed in performing work for other Federal agencies. The Committee concurs with the House Committee and believes that the Department should continue to obtain funds for general purpose equipment needed to perform work from the customer agency under a reimbursable arrangement.

The following tables show the Committee recommendations by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison to the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 1990	$22,638,000
Budget estimate, 1991	28,421,000
House allowance	28,421,000
Committee recommendation	28,421,000

An appropriation of $28,421,000 is recommended for the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Energy. This is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

This appropriation provides agencywide audit and investigative functions to identify and correct management and administrative deficiencies which create conditions for existing or potential instances of fraud, waste, and mismanagement. The audits function provides internal audit, contract audit, and inspections services.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Section 302(a) of Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Alaska Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation including the transmission and disposition of electric power and energy from Falcon and Amistad Dams, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

Bonneville Power operations are self-financing under authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974. The act authorizes Bonneville Power to use its revenues to finance operating costs, capital construction, and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining capital program requirements. All of the other power marketing administrations are funded annually with appropriations, and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury.

RATE AND REPAYMENT REFORM

The administration is proposing rate and repayment reforms in fiscal year 1991 that would cause significant increases in the rates charged by the Power Marketing Administrations. The Committee believes that this type of reform would have significant adverse impact on the economic health of the regions supported by the PMA's and might result in less repayment to the Federal Government because of the loss of significant energy-intensive industries in the regions.

Therefore, the Committee has again included bill language preventing a change from a cost base to market base for PMA rates. This language is intended to prevent a unilateral change in the terms of agreement that were made years ago between the Federal Government and the regions served by the PMA's.

The following table summarizes the appropriations recommended for the power marketing administrations.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(278,348,000)	(300,418,000)	(300,418,000)	(330,418,000)
(Capital equipment)...................................	(14,478,000)	(14,990,000)	(14,990,000)	(14,990,000)
(Construction)..	(985,000)	(14,592,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)
Independent R & D reduction............................	---	---	-100,000,000	---
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES................	9,646,193,000	8,544,900,000	10,915,148,000	10,980,258,000
(Operating expenses)...................................	(7,936,225,000)	(6,937,415,000)	(8,921,330,000)	(8,964,040,000)
(Capital equipment)...................................	(500,006,000)	(479,191,000)	(569,410,000)	(561,210,000)
(Construction)..	(1,209,962,000)	(1,128,294,000)	(1,424,408,000)	(1,455,008,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION				
I. Administrative operations				
A. Office of the Secretary - salaries and expenses	2,073,000	3,911,000	3,911,000	3,911,000
B. General management - personnel compensation and benefits	152,126,000	153,227,000	153,227,000	153,227,000
C. General management - other expenses				
1. Travel	5,923,000	5,314,000	5,314,000	5,314,000
2. Services	129,618,000	132,137,000	132,137,000	132,137,000
3. Capital equipment	3,231,000	4,942,000	4,942,000	4,942,000
Subtotal, Other expenses	138,772,000	142,393,000	142,393,000	142,393,000
D. Program support				
1. Policy analysis and system studies	2,567,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
3. Consumer affairs	64,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
4. Public affairs	266,000	42,000	42,000	42,000
5. Competition	49,000	---	---	---
6. International policy studies	987,000	1,359,000	1,359,000	1,359,000
7. Office of minority economic impact	3,455,000	2,832,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Subtotal, Program support	7,388,000	8,578,000	9,246,000	9,246,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Administrative operations..................	300,359,000	308,109,000	308,777,000	308,777,000
II. Cost of work for others.........................	82,825,000	116,131,000	91,718,000	91,718,000
III. Miscellaneous revenues..........................	-147,900,000	-183,413,000	-150,000,000	-150,000,000
Subtotal, Departmental administration................	235,284,000	240,827,000	250,495,000	250,495,000
Use of unobligated balances..........................	-33,099,000	-16,400,000	-16,400,000	-16,400,000
General reduction....................................	---	---	-9,000,000	-9,000,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION....................	202,185,000	224,427,000	225,095,000	225,095,000
(Operating expenses).................................	(198,954,000)	(219,485,000)	(220,153,000)	(220,153,000)
(Capital equipment).................................	(3,231,000)	(4,942,000)	(4,942,000)	(4,942,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION				
I. Operation and maintenance				
A. Power marketing				
1. Operating expenses	3,134,000	3,233,000	3,233,000	3,233,000
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
I. Operation and maintenance				
A. Power marketing				
1. Operating expenses	2,324,000	2,624,000	2,624,000	2,624,000
2. Purchase power and wheeling	16,132,000	17,661,000	17,661,000	17,661,000
3. Use of prior year balances	---	-11,000,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	18,456,000	9,285,000	9,285,000	9,285,000

ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1990	$3,134,000
Budget estimate, 1991	3,233,000
House allowance	3,233,000
Committee recommendation	3,233,000

An appropriation of $3,233,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Alaska Power Administration is responsible for operation, maintenance, and power marketing of two Federal hydroelectric projects in Alaska. The operating projects are the 30,000-kilowatt Eklutna project near Anchorage and the 47,160-kilowatt Snettisham project near Juneau. Project facilities include dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission systems, and necessary maintenance facilities. Power is marketed at wholesale to five Alaskan utilities. The projects represent a current Federal investment of $174,000,000 and a replacement value in excess of $336,000,000.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

The Bonneville Power Administration [BPA] is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000-square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent Western States in the Columbia River drainage basin. BPA markets electric power from 30 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. BPA also markets and exchanges surplus electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

BPA constructs, operates, and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system (14,653 circuit-miles of transmission line and 387 substations by the end of fiscal year 1990).

Public Law 93-454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, placed BPA on a self-financed basis. With the passage in 1980 of Public Law 96-501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, BPA's responsibilities were expanded to include meeting the net firm load growth of the region, to protect fish and wildlife resources, and to invest in cost-effective, regionwide energy conservation and to acquire generating resources to meet these requirements.

Borrowing authority.—A total of $3,750,000,000 has been made available to BPA as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts BPA plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation on Bonneville's borrowing requirements. While the Committee did not hold hearings on the fiscal year 1991 budget for BPA, the Committee has actively followed and questioned BPA and the Northwest Power Planning Council regarding the BPA Resource Planning Program in perspective processes to ensure that the Committee's fiscal 1991 borrowing estimate for BPA reflects the most recent regional planning assumptions and the guidance the Committee provided in the fiscal year 1990 report. For fiscal year 1991, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $375,300,000 in new borrowing authority for tranmission system development, capital maintenance/replacement, energy conservation, fish and wildlife, and capital equipment programs.

This $375,300,000 increment provides (1) a $248,300,000 estimate of obligation of borrowing authority sufficient to fund the proposed fiscal 1991 capital investment program proposed in January 1990—this level included a $45,600,000 higher estimate of obligation of borrowing authority for the third alternating current intertie and $32,600,000 more for other capital investments proposed in the congressional submission; (2) an additional $25,200,000 estimate to continue obligation of authorized borrowing authority for conservation investments having long-term benefits and capitalizing energy resource acquisition (including conservation) consistent with BPA's established financial policies and electric rates; (3) an additional $20,500,000 estimate to acquire additional industrial conservation and sitespecific commercial conservation; (4) an additional $15,800,000 estimate which includes an additional $19,600,000 to reduce the current backlog of deferred capitalized maintenance/replacement work required to maintain the BPA transmission system and remove and cleanup polychlorinated biphenylls [PCB's] and a reduction of $3,800,000 for miscellaneous other capital program adjustments; and (5) an additional $65,500,000 to provide for carryover of any previously estimated, but unobligated, fiscal year 1990 borrowing authority for the third alternating current intertie, and to provide funding to mitigate the Seattle area voltage problem.

Repayment.—The Committee notes with approval the continuing improvement in BPA's financial condition despite difficult water conditions. In fiscal year 1989, BPA paid the U.S. Treasury $606,400,000, including $152,200,000 for amortization. At the end of fiscal year 1989, BPA was current in its payments of interest and amortization to the Treasury.

Columbia-Snake River salmon.—As discussed earlier in this report, the Committee is very concerned about petitions that have been filed pursuant to the Endangered Species Act which, if deemed warranted by the Secretary of Commerce and the National Marine Fisheries Service, would declare five Columbia and Snake River salmon runs as threatened or endangered. The potential for listing of just one Columbia or Snake River salmon run portends enormous consequences to operation of the Federal hydroelectric, flood control and irrigation projects on the Columbia River system, and would implicate international treaties with Canada and with native American tribes. Such a finding would have equal deleterious impacts on the United States Treasury which relies on revenues derived from operation of these Federal facilities. Therefore, the Committee strongly recommends that the Northwest Power Planning Council, in conjunction with the States, other Federal agencies, and interest groups, devise a process whereby a list of management alternatives could be prepared and implemented in the event that the scientific review process under the Endangered Species Act were to indicate that a listing is likely.

Fish enhancement facilities.—The Committee recommends approval of the administration proposals to construct the Yakima Basin screen facilities, phase II. These facilities will protect BPA's investment in the Yakima Hatchery project by preventing the juvenile salmon and steelhead fish from being lost into irrigation diversions as they migrate down from the hatchery.

Limitation on direct loans.—The Committee recommends that no new direct loans be made in fiscal year 1991, as requested in the budget. This level is adequate for BPA to carry out its responsibilities as required by law.

Pacific intertie.—BPA funding to continue work on the third alternating current intertie is included in this budget. The Committee recognizes that the inability of California, Investor Owned Utilities to receive approval to proceed with the project has delayed the initiation of project construction. The Committee recognizes that, due to this delay, it may be necessary for a substantial amount of BPA's planned fiscal year 1990 borrowing authority to shift into fiscal 1991, increasing obligations of borrowing authority above the January 1990 estimate for fiscal year 1991.

The President's fiscal 1991 congressional budget assumes the continued availability of BPA borrowing for construction of the third alternating current system upgrades, but for fiscal 1991 and subsequent years, assumes about two-thirds of such costs would be financed by non-Federal participants. The fiscal 1991 budget assumes payments of $45,600,000 will be collected in fiscal year 1991 from non-Federal participants, which along with $22,000,000 of estimated use of new borrowing authority would provide for $67,600,000 of new obligations. The Office of Management and Budget has agreed that if non-Federal participation payments are not received, BPA will utilize BPA's existing borrowing authority to finance the project.

While BPA began a rate case in November 1989 to determine a pricing methodology for non-Federal participation and is preparing an implementation plan for its environmental impact statement on non-Federal participation and non-Federal ownership options, the Committee believes these processes cannot be completed soon enough so that potential non-Federal funds could be received during fiscal 1991. Because of this, the fiscal year 1991 estimate use of BPA's borrowing authority is recommended by the Committee at $136,600,000, the most recent estimate for fiscal year 1991 BPA third alternating current and related system reactive obligations. This will financially assure that the Federal Government can expeditiously initiate the construction of this project as authorized by Public Law 98-360.

The Committee recognizes that the fiscal year 1990, fiscal year 1991, and out-year amounts of borrowing authority and obligation can change in accordance with changes in the schedule of the line, but that BPA's ability to move ahead with the line is key to providing confidence to financial markets and regulators such that the southern end of the line can also proceed on schedule. The Administrator should notify the Committee of any schedule changes and needed funding adjustments in the fiscal year 1992 budget submission or sooner if required.

Conservation.—Given the declining surplus of electricity in the Pacific Northwest, the Committee last year expressed concern that several objectives in the least-cost plan have not yet been achieved. The Committee stated that: (1) BPA shall continue its efforts to increase staff and other support in fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for lost opportunity conservation programs, including pilot programs in the commercial and industrial sectors; (2) the objective of these efforts should be to gain sufficient experience and capability so that in fiscal year 1992, or earlier, BPA is able to operate programs designed to capture all cost effective lost opportunities in its customers' service territories; and (3) BPA should continue to work closely with and be guided by the act consistently with the Council's plan in developing conservation programs.

The Committee understands that estimated conservation obligations presented in the fiscal year 1991 BPA congressional budget submission were transitional estimates based on earlier planning which do not reflect actions by BPA to respond to the concerns reported by the Committee last year. The Committee is pleased to note both (1) the recent enactment by the Washington State Legislature of residential model conservation standards [MCS]; and (2) the BPA Administrator's recently announced program level proposal to aggressively acquire commercial and industrial conservation resources to meet electric loads consistent with the least-cost planning objectives.

The Administrator's program for the fiscal year 1990 through fiscal year 1993 period are an important step in assuring a smooth transition to the aggressive programs planned for fiscal 1992 and beyond. For example, BPA proposes to acquire significant new lost opportunities in the residential sector starting in fiscal year 1990 due to code adoption in Washington and plans to advance major commercial and industrial programs into the fiscal years 1990 and 1991 time period.

The Committee is supportive of the BPA response to its concerns and has provided an additional estimate of fiscal year 1991 borrowing authority of $20,500,000 to ensure resources are adequate to achieve these proposals. The Committee is also aware that BPA has increased its estimate of conservation borrowing requirements for 1990 by $9,400,000 in order to meet the Administrator's commitment to financially support early local adoption of the residential MCS. The Committee understands that this increased funding for MCS can be accommodated within the BPA borrowing authority of $258,200,000 for fiscal year 1990 reported by the Committee last year. The Committee looks forward to review of the Administrator's commitment to conservation resource acquisition.

System maintenance and replacement.—The Committee recognized that in past years BPA has deferred important maintenance/replacement on its electric transmission system due to financial constraints. BPA's new operation and maintenance/replacement 10-year plan for the period 1990 through 1999 has established schedules to reduce the current backlog of deferred maintenance and maintain levelized maintenance in the future. Implementation of the plan will allow BPA to better protect the existing system as well as cleanup and remove PCB contamination as outlined in a

BPA memorandum of agreement with the Federal Environmental Protection Administration.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1990	$18,456,000
Budget estimate, 1991	9,285,000
House allowance	9,285,000
Committee recommendation	9,285,000

The Committee recommendation concurs with House action which appropriates $9,285,000 for the Southeastern Power Administration.

The Southeastern Power Administration [SEPA] markets hydroelectric power produced at Federal projects located in 10 Southeastern States in accordance with policy directives contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The States include Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi. There are 22 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092,375 kilowatts.

Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through wheeling arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility of the wheeling service performed.

The Committee recommends $9,285,000 for fiscal year 1991 which will provide for the continuation of the basic power marketing program. SEPA's budget request for purchase power and wheeling has been steadily increasing for several years. This rise was due to phasing-in of a policy of full cost of service for wheeling activities. These costs are fully recovered and therefore no net increase in expense was occurring.

The Administration is proposing in fiscal 1991 to sell the marketing rights of the Georgia-Alabama System to existing power customers. The SEPA budget request does not include any funds for this purpose nor does the recommended appropriation include any. The Committee reiterates its position that this proposed study and the actual divestiture of Southeastern require the enactment of appropriate authorizing legislation. To date, such legislation has not been enacted.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1990	$25,057,000
Budget estimate, 1991	20,107,000
House allowance	20,107,000
Committee recommendation	20,107,000

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $20,107,000. This is the same as the budget request.

The Southwestern Power Administration [SWPA] is the marketing agent for the disposal of power and energy generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana. It is headquartered in Tulsa, OK, with an operation control center located in Springfield, MO, and maintenance crews and support warehouses located in Muskeg and Ada, OK; Jonesboro, AR; and Springfield, MO.

The SWPA provides transmission lines, substations, switching stations, and communication facilities for integration and optimal distribution of electricity from hydroelectric projects for transmission and sale of power to geographically dispersed customers.

The SWPA schedules and controls the generation of power from 23 hydroelectric projects. In addition, the SWPA operates and maintains 1,380 miles of transmission lines consisting of 161 kilovolts, 138 volts, and 69 kilovolts wood pole and steel construction. It performs maintenance on 35 radio and microwave stations, 34 switching stations and substations, with a total installed capacity of 2,150,400 kilowatts.

The recommendation for fiscal year 1991 continues to reflect the availability for use of unobligated appropriations from prior years.

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1990	$290,654,000
Budget estimate, 1991	293,762,000
House allowance	293,762,000
Committee recommendation	293,762,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $293,762,000, which is the same as the House allowance.

The Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance Program of the Western Area Power Administration [WAPA], excluding the Colorado River storage project and Fort Peck project, involves marketing federally generated hydroelectric power within a 15-State area in the West.

Western is responsible for the operation and maintenance of more than 16,000 miles of transmission lines and 259 substations. Electric power marketed by Western is generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission in Texas, all of which operate some 51 hydropower generating plants in Western's service area with a current maximum operating capacity of 10,407 megawatts.

The Committee concurs with the House Committee on the construction of the Harold T. "Bizz" Johnson California-Oregon Transmission Project.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1990	$114,918,000
Budget estimate, 1991	122,750,000
House allowance	122,750,000
Committee recommendation	122,750,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 1990	–$114,918,000
Budget estimate, 1991	–122,750,000
House allowance	–122,750,000
Committee recommendation	–122,750,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1990	
Budget estimate, 1991	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	

The Committee concurs with the House action in recommending $122,750,000 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Section 204 and title IV of Public Law 95–91, the Department of Energy Organization Act, established within the Department of Energy, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] to carry out functions transferred from the Federal Power Commission for hydroelectric, electric utility, and natural gas regulation and from the Interstate Commerce Commission for oil pipeline regulation.

The act sets out the clear intent of Congress that the Commission be independent from supervision or direction from any other officer of the Department, but provides that the Secretary shall provide to the Commission such support and facilities as the Commission determines it needs to carry out its functions. This support includes services for personnel, accounting, facilities support, computer operations, procurement, and other similar services funded elsewhere in the departmental request.

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

Appropriations, 1990	$74,000
Budget estimate, 1991	80,000
House allowance	80,000
Committee recommendation	80,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $80,000. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Geothermal Loan Guarantee and Interest Assistance Program is authorized under the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–410), as amended by the Department of Energy Act of 1978—Civilian Applications (Public Law 95–238).

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1990	$147,900,000
Budget estimate, 1991	50,000,000
House allowance	150,000,000
Committee recommendation	180,000,000

The Committee recommends $180,000,000 for the Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] activities, including salaries and expenses.

Within the amount recommended for Appalachian regional development programs, the Committee has provided $45,000,000 for Corridor G.

The Committee has included $350,000 to be used to continue the tourism development work initiated in the current fiscal year in accordance with the Senate report accompanying the fiscal year 1990 appropriation bill.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1990	$6,865,000
Budget estimate, 1991	12,500,000
House allowance	11,000,000
Committee recommendation	11,000,000

The Committee recommendation concurs with the House in providing $11,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Defense Nuclear Safety Board.

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board was created by the 1989 Defense Authorization Act. The Board, appointed by the President, advises the Secretary of Energy and reports to Congress on safety matters of the Department's defense nuclear reactors. The five-member board is expected to eventually require a staff level of nearly 100 FTE's.

Fiscal year 1991 is the first full year of operation for the agency, having spent much of 1990 performing initial operational activities and hiring staff. The Committee recommendation of $11,000,000 reflects a reduction of $1,500,000 because of the availability of prior years unobligated funds. The recommended funding level combined with the unobligated balances provide full funding for activities proposed in 1991.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1990	$211,000
Budget estimate, 1991	224,000
House allowance	224,000
Committee recommendation	224,000

An appropriation of $224,000 is recommended for the Delaware River Basin Commission salaries and expenses. This is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The Delaware River Basin Commission was created by compact (under Public Law 87-328) among the States of Delaware, New Jersey, New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government. The compact enables the Commission to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Delaware River and its tributaries.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1990	$340,000
Budget estimate, 1991	457,000
House allowance	457,000
Committee recommendation	457,000

The Committee concurs with the House in recommending $457,000 for fiscal year 1990.

This appropriation provides the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expense budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission. The Commission's expense budget for 1989 is $2,689,900.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriations, 1990	$296,000
Budget estimate, 1991	
House allowance	200,000
Committee recommendation	538,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $538,000 for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by compact among the States in the basin of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government. The Commission has the responsibility for basinwide water quality, planning, program coordination, and assistance.

The Committee has provided additional funds for the Commission to support the Anacostia River study and a cooperative fisheries development program at Jennings Randolph Lake.

The Committee expects the Commission to continue to work with the communities of Petersburg and Moorefield, WV, on flood control measures.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations, 1990	$435,911,000
Budget estimate, 1991	471,320,000
House allowance	471,320,000
Committee recommendation	471,320,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1990	−$146,850,000
Budget estimate, 1991	−156,750,000
House allowance	−156,750,000
Committee recommendation	−156,750,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1990	$289,061,000
Budget estimate, 1991	314,570,000
House allowance	314,570,000
Committee recommendation	314,570,000

A net appropriation of $314,500,000 is recommended for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission [NRC].

The Committee notes that the administration proposed that $19,650,000 of the appropriation for the NRC be derived from the nuclear waste fund. These funds are required to fund the NRC efforts focused on implementation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act as amended in 1987 and DOE's efforts to characterize the Yucca Mountain site. The administration also proposed appropriation language which includes a provision for collection of the authorized revenues of $156,750,000.

The Committee concurs with the House Committee commending the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for its recent rulemaking on standarization and licensing reform, important components to continued development of nuclear power in this country.

The committee is concerned about the schedule slippage for completion of design certification reviews by the Commission for evolutionary and passive reactors. The Committee believes that timely completion of design certification reviews is vital to meeting the country's baseload generation needs by the end of the decade by providing the nuclear option to electric utilities in their planning process by the mid-1990's.

Electric utilities cannot apply for combined licenses under the improved nuclear licensing rule issued by the Commission in 1989 until reactor designs are certified. For that reason, each delay in design certification causes a commensurate delay in the next commercial nuclear powerplant order.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Commission to dedicate the necessary resources to the design review process in order to main-

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
I. Operation and maintenance				
A. Power marketing				
1. Operating expenses	17,201,000	17,316,000	17,316,000	17,316,000
2. Purchase power and wheeling	7,020,000	7,899,000	7,899,000	7,899,000
3. Construction	9,236,000	10,182,000	10,182,000	10,182,000
4. Use of prior year balances	-8,400,000	-15,290,000	-15,290,000	-15,290,000
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	25,057,000	20,107,000	20,107,000	20,107,000
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION				
I. Operation and maintenance				
A. Power marketing				
1. Construction and rehabilitation	93,517,000	110,520,000	110,520,000	110,520,000
2. System operation and maintenance	98,514,000	115,509,000	115,509,000	115,509,000
3. Purchase power and wheeling	98,623,000	95,298,000	95,298,000	95,298,000
4. Unobligated balances	---	-27,565,000	-27,565,000	-27,565,000
5. Transfer of permanent authority from DOI	(3,564,000)	(4,702,000)	(4,702,000)	(4,702,000)
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	290,654,000	293,762,000	293,762,000	293,762,000

tain the schedule for completing certification for standard evolutionary designs and standard passive designs by 1991–92 and 1994–95, respectively. If the Commission cannot meet this schedule, it is directed to submit a report to this Committee within 60 days detailing the resource requirements necessary to comply with the earlier schedules established by the Commission.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 1990	$2,859,000
Budget estimate, 1991	3,680,000
House allowance	3,680,000
Committee recommendation	3,680,000

The appropriation recommended provides for the Office of the Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The Inspector General Acts Amendments of 1988 established a statutory Office of the Inspector General within the NRC, effective on April 17, 1989. The functions of the Office of the Inspector General is to provide the Commission with an independent review and appraisal of the integrity of NRC programs and operations. Internal audits review and evaluate all facets of agency operations. The investigative function provides for the detection and investigation of improper and illegal activities involving agency programs, personnel, and operations.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1990	$197,000
Budget estimate, 1991	211,000
House allowance	211,000
Committee recommendation	211,000

The Committee recommends $211,000 for salaries and expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff, and is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission was created by compact (Public Law 91–575) among the States of Maryland, New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government to enable them to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River basin and its tributaries.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1990	$272,000
Budget estimate, 1991	290,000
House allowance	290,000
Committee recommendation	290,000

An amount of $290,000 is recommended by the Committee, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expenses budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission.

The 1991 current expense budget of the Commission is $1,795,000.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 1990	$119,306,000
Budget estimate, 1991	91,302,000
House allowance	135,000,000
Committee recommendation	125,000,000

The Committee recommend an appropriation of $125,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority [TVA].

Consistent with the mission of TVA and the activities it conducts, the Committee feels the agency can effectly address many nationally significant environmental issues. These include the handling of municipal solid waste; improving reservoir and stream dissolved oxygen levels; the use of fertilizers and pesticides; wildlife restoration; treatment of mine runoff and municipal wastewater by manmade wetlands; multipurpose management of forests for wildlife habitat, timber production, and recreation use; and development of effective ways of integrating environmental understanding into classes on basic education skills, to name but a few.

The Committee recommends that TVA work in close partnership with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and the private sector in sharing its experience in environmental matters and in transferring new technologies into the appropriate marketplace. The Committee believes TVA-developed technologies can be used or adapted for use to provide solutions to environmental problems in other parts of the Nation, as well as the Tennessee Valley.

The Senate Clean Air Act approved earlier this year includes a provision directing TVA to develop a plan for the construction of a combustion unit capable of using refuse derived fuel [RDF], including a specific analysis of the site of the existing coal fired power facility located at Gallatin, TN. The Committee agrees that TVA should play a leading role in the demonstration of alternative methods of solid waste management, and it endorses the ongoing research being conducted on RDF technology at the National Fertilizer and Environmental Research Center.

In addition, the Committee believes that the TVA should evaluate if and how the agency can respond to the National Competitiveness Technology Transfer Act of 1989. The unique capabilities of TVA as a national demonstration laboratory may offer special opportunities for joint ventures with the private sector through the use of TVA's technical and scientific expertise.

The following table shows the allocation of the funds recommended for activities under this heading.

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1990 estimate	1991 budget request	1991 Committee recommendation
Stewardship	51,229	63,874	62,900
Water and land	11,080	4,980	9,500
Land Between The Lakes	3,398	2,348	3,400
Rural development	20,568	—	16,200
National Fertilizer and Environmental Research Center	33,031	20,100	33,000
Total appropriations	119,306	91,302	125,000

OTHER TEMPORARY COMMISSIONS

OFFICE OF THE NUCLEAR WASTE NEGOTIATOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1990	$1,972,000
Budget estimate, 1991	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	

This appropriation provides for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed the Board to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of the activities of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board must report its findings not less than two times a year to the Congress and the Secretary of Energy.

The administration has not requested additional appropriations for this activity for fiscal year 1991 due to the availability of prior year unobligated funds.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1990	$1,972,000
Budget estimate, 1991	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	

This appropriation provides for the Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendents of 1987 directed the Nuclear Waste Negotiator to attempt to find a State or Indian tribe willing to host a nuclear waste repository or monitored retrivable storage facility at a technically qualified site on reasonable terms and to negotiate with any State or Indian tribe which expresses an interest in hosting a repository or monitored retrievable storage facility.

The administration has not requested additional appropriations for this activity in fiscal year 1991 due to the availability of prior unobligated funds.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISION

Bonneville Power-Administration employment levels.—The Committee is very concerned that the historic budget and planning agreement, specifically the staffing resources understanding between BPA and the Office of Management and Budget, are again failing to provide the electric ratepayers of the Pacific Northwest the planning certainty and flexibility they have been paying for since regional self-financing was authorized in the 1974 Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act.

Because of concerns raised by Congress during consideration of that act, then-OMB Associate Director Frank G. Zarb and Under Secretary of the Interior John C. Whitaker committed that "the regional interests in the Pacific Northwest are prepared to assume the higher cost associated with this form of financing in exchange for assurance that BPA will have the flexibility and capability to provide the transmission facilities required within the region on a timely and reliable basis. Therefore, the basic understanding must recite that the budget planning allowances for BPA, including personnel ceilings, will be separate from the planning allowances for the Department and will be adequate to enable BPA to meet planning schedules."

This agreement has been reaffirmed to the Congress by virtually every administration representative since 1974, including during the transfer of BPA from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Energy in 1977 and upon passage of the Northwest Power Planning and Conservation Act in 1980. Most recently, this Committee intervened in 1988 to seek a reaffirmation of this agreement without necessitating further congressional involvement. An exchange of letters took place in June 1988 between Robert K. Dawson, Associate Director for Natural Resources, Energy and Science at OMB and Joseph F. Salgado, Under Secretary, Department of Energy. The agreement embodied in these letters provide that "OMB will reinstitute the practice of indicating the budgetary and employment requirements for BPA within the total DOE allowance."

The President's fiscal year 1991 budget proposes to amend BPA's employment levels in the middle of the current operating year (a reduction of 100 FTE in fiscal year 1990), and has proposed further reductions in the current budget year (another 100 FTE reduction in fiscal year 1991). The Committee especially objects to the retroactive reduction of BPA's operating year (fiscal year 1990) employment resources below the 3,300 full-time equivalent level this Committee reviewed during consideration of the fiscal year 1990 budget. A reduction of employment levels in the middle of an operating year presents significant problems to the certainty and planning BPA has been promised by OMB and the Congress.

These proposed reductions in employment levels by OMB come after BPA, in order to reduce its costs, voluntarily reduced staff by about 300 FTE (10 percent) since 1984. Moreover, it should be noted that the current staffing level (3,300 FTE) is below that which existed prior to passage of the Northwest Power Planning and Conservation Act in 1980 (3,363 FTE).

The Pacific Northwest retail utility customer representatives indicate these employment ceiling reductions are very imprudent given the challenges that now face BPA. This Committee strongly agrees. BPA no longer has a large power surplus condition existing in the region, but must ramp-up its acquisition of cost-effective conservation and other resources. Further, the aging BPA transmission system needs increasing maintenance and replacements to assure safety, reliability, cost effectiveness, and cleanup of hazardous waste materials. Moreover, as already noted in this report the region is facing enormous uncertainty with the pending review of petitions that would declare five Columbia and Snake River salmon runs as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. All these demands are coming at a time when there is rapid economic growth in the Seattle and Puget Sound area that is creating load growth and transmission capacity problems that must be evaluated and resolved. Further, major operating and marketing relationships will require substantial personnel resources to redefine and renegotiate during the coming years. Examples include the need for closer cooperation with B.C. Hydro prior to expiration of the Columbia Storage and Power Exchange Agreement in 1998; cooperation with United States utilities prior to renegotiations of the Canadian Entitlement Allocation Agreement by 1993; and increased cooperation with the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation during development of the systems operations review and accompanying environmental impact statement.

For all these reasons, the Committee continues to believe that the dynamic electric utility planning and operating environment within the entire Pacific Northwest region, including investor-owned utilities, is heavily dependent on BPA's involvement and leadership. This is simply not possible unless Bonneville retains the staffing flexibility necessary to meet these multiple regional demands. Because of this the Committee has included bill language to provide that (1) the flexibility and planning assurances envisioned in the legislative history of the 1974 act will be provided to the region by the BPA Administrator and (2) BPA will be able to plan with certainty and carry out its ratepayer financed, electric utility programs in a logical, businesslike manner. This action will not affect the President's budget, but is intended to avoid work delays and higher contracting costs. The Committee expects BPA to establish and allocate staffing levels in consultation with regional ratepayers and the Office of Management and Budget.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1991: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development	20,900	20,893	19,900	[1] 19,758
Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill:				
1991				[2] 12,774
1992				6,459
1993				1,386
1994				68
1995 and future year				40
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1991 in the bill		173		12
	Direct loans		Loan guarantees	
Credit authority estimates, fiscal year 1991	NA	5	NA	

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill.]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1990	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991	Increase or decrease
PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY			
FEDERAL FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Permanent appropriations	$12,000,000	$12,000,000	
Department of the Interior:			
Bureau of Reclamation: Miscellaneous appropriations	282,000	280,000	−$2,000
Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project	63,608,000	34,165,000	−29,443,000
Department of Energy:			
Payments to States under Federal Power Act	2,249,000	2,343,000	+94,000
Bonneville Power Administration Fund (authority to borrow)	258,200,000	170,100,000	−88,100,000
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund (authority to borrow)	357,673,000	432,672,000	+74,999,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	694,012,000	651,560,000	−42,452,000
TRUST FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Rivers and harbors contributed funds	160,000,000	205,500,000	+45,500,000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation trust funds	54,100,000	93,886,000	+39,786,000
Department of Energy: Advances for cooperative work	27,179,000	18,897,000	−8,282,000
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust funds	4,416,000	4,564,000	+148,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds	245,695,000	322,847,000	+77,152,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1990 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recom-mendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1990 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers - Civil							
General investigations	129,251,000	135,400,000	167,847,000	153,335,000	+24,084,000	+17,935,000	-14,512,000
Construction, general	1,083,811,000	1,226,000,000	1,362,025,000	1,308,043,000	+224,232,000	+82,043,000	-53,982,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	331,296,000	334,500,000	342,731,000	338,993,000	+7,697,000	+4,493,000	-3,738,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,398,219,000	1,389,500,000	1,457,488,000	1,408,791,000	+10,572,000	+19,291,000	-48,697,000
Regulatory program	68,455,000	75,100,000	71,100,000	71,100,000	+2,645,000	-4,000,000	---
Flood control and coastal emergencies	20,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	---	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
Revolving Fund	9,860,000	---	---	---	-9,860,000	---	---
General expenses	141,997,000	136,100,000	136,100,000	136,100,000	-5,897,000	---	---
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil, new budget (obligational) authority	3,182,889,000	3,321,600,000	3,562,291,000	3,436,362,000	+253,473,000	+114,762,000	-125,929,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Bureau of Reclamation							
General investigations	11,369,000	11,456,000	12,926,000	12,521,000	+1,152,000	+1,065,000	-405,000
Construction program	652,850,000	609,430,000	649,697,000	641,027,000	-11,823,000	+31,597,000	-8,670,000
Operation and maintenance	209,315,000	231,516,000	231,516,000	231,516,000	+22,201,000	---	---
Loan program	33,644,000	5,708,000	5,708,000	5,708,000	-27,936,000	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(31,475,000)	(4,946,000)	(4,946,000)	(4,946,000)	(-26,529,000)	---	---
General administrative expenses	47,311,000	51,431,000	51,431,000	51,431,000	+4,120,000	---	---
Emergency fund	986,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+14,000	---	---
Working Capital fund	8,381,000	4,831,000	4,831,000	4,831,000	-3,550,000	---	---
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(-3,564,000)	(-4,702,000)	(-4,702,000)	(-4,702,000)	(-1,138,000)	---	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	963,856,000	915,372,000	957,109,000	948,034,000	-15,822,000	+32,662,000	-9,075,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item (1)	1990 appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recommendation (5)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –): 1990 appropriation (6)	Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
Total, title II, Department of the Interior:							
New budget (obligational) authority..........	963,856,000	915,372,000	957,109,000	948,034,000	-15,822,000	+32,662,000	-9,075,000
(Limitation on direct loans).................	(31,475,000)	(4,946,000)	(4,946,000)	(4,946,000)	(-26,529,000)	---	---
(By transfer)................................	(-3,564,000)	(-4,702,000)	(-4,702,000)	(-4,702,000)	(-1,138,000)	---	---
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:							
Operating Expenses................................	1,916,768,000	1,808,706,000	2,362,722,000	2,405,065,000	+488,297,000	+596,359,000	+42,343,000
Plant and Capital Equipment.......................	267,681,000	296,631,000	340,550,000	340,550,000	+72,869,000	+43,919,000	---
Total...	2,184,449,000	2,105,337,000	2,703,272,000	2,745,615,000	+561,166,000	+640,278,000	+42,343,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities:							
Operating Expenses................................	1,347,096,000	1,262,473,000	1,310,973,000	1,262,473,000	-84,623,000	---	-48,500,000
Plant and Capital Equipment.......................	65,341,000	77,545,000	95,045,000	77,545,000	+12,204,000	---	-17,500,000
Subtotal..	1,412,437,000	1,340,018,000	1,406,018,000	1,340,018,000	-72,419,000	---	-66,000,000
Gross revenues....................................	-1,500,900,000	-1,450,400,000	-1,530,500,000	-1,450,400,000	+50,500,000	---	+80,100,000
Net appropriation.................................	-88,463,000	-110,382,000	-124,482,000	-110,382,000	-21,919,000	---	+14,100,000
General Science and Research Activities:							
Operating Expenses................................	737,566,000	829,634,000	829,634,000	829,634,000	+92,068,000	---	---
Plant and Capital Equipment.......................	361,263,000	444,098,000	444,098,000	444,098,000	+82,835,000	---	---
Total...	1,098,829,000	1,273,732,000	1,273,732,000	1,273,732,000	+174,903,000	---	---
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund............................	295,156,000	292,833,000	292,833,000	292,833,000	-2,323,000	---	---
Isotope production and distribution fund..............	16,016,000	---	---	---	-16,016,000	---	---
Environmental restoration and waste management........	---	2,806,284,000	---	---	---	-2,806,284,000	---

Environmental restoration and waste management:							
Defense function	---	(2,361,751,000)	(2,714,807,000)	(2,680,616,000)	(+2,680,616,000)	(+318,865,000)	(-34,191,000)
Non-defense function	---	(429,685,000)	(563,685,000)	(513,685,000)	(+513,685,000)	(+84,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
Total, Environmental restoration and waste mgmt.	---	(2,791,436,000)	(3,278,492,000)	(3,194,301,000)	(+3,194,301,000)	(+402,865,000)	(-84,191,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:							
Operating Expenses	7,936,225,000	6,937,415,000	8,921,330,000	8,964,040,000	+1,027,815,000	+2,026,625,000	+42,710,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	1,709,968,000	1,607,485,000	1,993,818,000	2,016,218,000	+306,250,000	+408,733,000	+22,400,000
Total	9,646,193,000	8,544,900,000	10,915,148,000	10,980,258,000	+1,334,065,000	+2,435,358,000	+65,110,000
Departmental Administration:							
Operating Expenses	346,854,000	402,898,000	370,153,000	370,153,000	+23,299,000	-32,745,000	---
Plant and Capital Equipment	3,231,000	4,942,000	4,942,000	4,942,000	+1,711,000	---	---
Subtotal	350,085,000	407,840,000	375,095,000	375,095,000	+25,010,000	-32,745,000	---
Miscellaneous revenues	-147,900,000	-183,413,000	-150,000,000	-150,000,000	-2,100,000	+33,413,000	---
Net appropriation	202,185,000	224,427,000	225,095,000	225,095,000	+22,910,000	+668,000	---
Office of Inspector General	22,638,000	28,421,000	28,421,000	28,421,000	+5,783,000	---	---
Power Marketing Administrations							
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,134,000	3,233,000	3,233,000	3,233,000	+99,000	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	18,456,000	9,285,000	9,285,000	9,285,000	-9,171,000	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	25,057,000	20,107,000	20,107,000	20,107,000	-4,950,000	---	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	290,654,000	293,762,000	293,762,000	293,762,000	+3,108,000	---	---
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(3,564,000)	(4,702,000)	(4,702,000)	(4,702,000)	(+1,138,000)	---	---
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	337,301,000	326,387,000	326,387,000	326,387,000	-10,914,000	---	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses	114,918,000	122,750,000	122,750,000	122,750,000	+7,832,000	---	---
Revenues Applied	-114,918,000	-122,750,000	-122,750,000	-122,750,000	-7,832,000	---	---
Geothermal Resources Development Fund							
Geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program	74,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	+6,000	---	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy:							
New budget (obligational) authority	13,714,378,000	15,492,019,000	15,640,486,000	15,762,039,000	+2,047,661,000	+270,020,000	+121,553,000
(By transfer)	(3,564,000)	(4,702,000)	(4,702,000)	(4,702,000)	(+1,138,000)	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item (1)	1990 appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recommendation (5)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –)		
					1990 appropriation (6)	Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission	147,900,000	50,000,000	150,000,000	180,000,000	+32,100,000	+130,000,000	+30,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	6,865,000	12,500,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	+4,135,000	-1,500,000	---
Delaware River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	211,000	224,000	224,000	224,000	+13,000	---	---
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	340,000	457,000	457,000	457,000	+117,000	---	---
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	551,000	681,000	681,000	681,000	+130,000	---	---
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:							
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	296,000	---	200,000	538,000	+242,000	+538,000	+338,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	435,911,000	471,320,000	471,320,000	471,320,000	+35,409,000	---	---
Revenues	-146,850,000	-156,750,000	-156,750,000	-156,750,000	-9,900,000	---	---
Subtotal	289,061,000	314,570,000	314,570,000	314,570,000	+25,509,000	---	---
Office of Inspector General	2,859,000	3,680,000	3,680,000	3,680,000	+821,000	---	---
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	291,920,000	318,250,000	318,250,000	318,250,000	+26,330,000	---	---
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	197,000	211,000	211,000	211,000	+14,000	---	---
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	272,000	290,000	290,000	290,000	+18,000	---	---
Total, Susquehanna River Basin Commission	469,000	501,000	501,000	501,000	+32,000	---	---
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	119,306,000	91,302,000	135,000,000	125,000,000	+5,694,000	+33,698,000	-10,000,000
Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator	1,972,000	---	---	---	-1,972,000	---	---

Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	1,972,000	---	---	---	-1,972,000	---	---
Total, title IV, Independent agencies, new budget (obligational) authority	571,251,000	473,234,000	615,632,000	635,970,000	+64,719,000	+162,736,000	+20,338,000
Grand total:							
New budget (obligational) authority	18,432,374,000	20,202,225,000	20,775,518,000	20,782,405,000	+2,350,031,000	+580,180,000	+6,887,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(31,475,000)	(4,946,000)	(4,946,000)	(4,946,000)	(-26,529,000)	---	---
(By transfer)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---